The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 22, 1920 No. 2864

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 669

EDITORIALS:

The Allies' New War 672
William Dean Howells 673
The Release of Youth 674
Gasoline and Government 674
An Americanized Socialist Party 675

PHILANDER C. KNOX—DARK HORSE. By Oswald Garrison Villard .. 676
WHAT HAPPENED IN MEXICO. By Luis Lara Pardo 679
THE SITUATION IN SONORA. By Mary Austin 680
IDEAS AND MEN IN MEXICO. By Arthur Livingston 681
THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS IN SESSION. By Mary Heaton Vorse 684
NO QUARREL WITH THE GERMAN PEOPLE. By Ronald B. Hotson 685
ORGAN GRINDER. By David Rosenthal 686
RAIN. By Witter Bynner 686
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 686
CORRESPONDENCE 687
THOUGHT. By Charles R. Murphy 690
THINKING. By Virginia Woods Mackall 690

BOOKS:

The Passionate Pilgrim. By C. V. D. 690
The Agony of a Victorian. By Ludwig Lewisohn 691
The Way of a War. By Carl Becker 692
Moods of the Drama 693

ART: A Comparative Study in Rebellion. By N. N. 695
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 697

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

WILLIAM MacDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER ARTHUR GLEASON
LEWIS S. GANNETT

ERNEST H. GRUENING, Managing Editor
CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

Subscription Rates—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

"PLEASE God his intellectuals be not slipping," said Charles Lamb when his dog performed antics he could not understand. We have had the same feeling so often about the antics of the Premiers that it is pleasant to record that the meeting between Millerand and Lloyd George has resulted in the postponement of the Spa conference for another month and the final decision to tear up another section of the Treaty of Versailles and fix a definite sum for Germany to pay. That is altogether the best thing that has happened in regard to the treaty since it was signed—we mean the best thing for the Allies. Of course, it is also the best thing for Germany, for the economic interests of both parties to the treaty are identical. It means that Germany will not feel that she has been economically enslaved for generations to come, with a suspended sentence over her head, but that she has a definite penalty to pay. What that penalty will be is not yet settled. But to Lloyd George belongs the chief credit for this great step forward—perhaps he has recalled Burke's words that "Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom." He has been aided by France's great financial danger, which has actually led to the proposal that Germany shall pay the first instalment to France within the year by borrowing it where she can with Allied endorsements of the loan! Thus France and England have again officially admitted the unworkability of that abomination, the Treaty of Versailles, which they were proclaiming as a great pact of wisdom and justice a year ago. And Mr. Wilson is calling upon our Senate to ratify it without a single change despite all of this breaching of it by its other authors!

NO stouter fight for freedom has ever been waged in America than that of the American Civil Liberties Union. Wherever local czars set up their little despotisms, the Civil Liberties Union takes up the gage. Paterson, Lawrence, Passaic, Worcester, Philadelphia—in one city after another it has forced the local authorities to respect the right of free speech. Now comes Duquesne, in the Pittsburgh steel district, where every hall is shut to the workers, every vacant lot barred to them, and even the streets are closed by an ordinance which requires a permit from the mayor, who, being not only mayor, but chief of police, magistrate, bank president, president of the town council, and brother of the president of the Portvue Tin Plate Company, never grants permits to steel workers. Not a meeting was held in Duquesne throughout the steel strike. On Sunday, May 9, however, while State troopers, local police, plain clothes men, and uniformed steel mill police patrolled the streets, an automobile drew up at the corner of River and Linden Avenues, and six men spoke from it. Their speeches consisted of the words: "Gentlemen, we are here under the auspices of the American Federation of Labor to test the Constitutional rights of free—" That was as far as they got, but it was enough. They were arrested, and the mayor, chief of police, magistrate, etc., sentenced them to $100 fine or thirty days in jail. They chose jail. One of the six was William M. Fincke, a former minister and a Yale graduate. The others—Beaghen, Sause, Damich, Olchon, and Reilly—were A. F. of L. organizers. The case will be carried to the higher courts, where it is hard to believe that the Czar of Duquesne will be sustained. There is something of the spirit of Roger Williams and William Penn in the epic of free speech which such protestants are writing into the history of America today.

THE outlaw railroad strike, despite press assertions, refuses to be defeated. Indeed, the New York *World* reports that as a result of the tie-up "Federal control looms up"; and "Eventual ownership by the Government . . . within a very short period" is predicted "by one of the highest officials of the Administration." The newspapers are compelled to admit complete congestion in numerous central points and particularly in the Hoboken and Jersey City terminals. The railroads maintain that they are ninety per cent normal, while the outlaw strikers declare the railroads are operating not more than ten per cent of their freight traffic. Somewhere between the two figures the truth lies and it is much nearer to the strikers' figures than to those put forward by the companies. This is proved by the fact that industrial business in New York is beginning to be paralyzed, and that few of the railroads terminating in this city will accept traffic for western points,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which fact they blame upon the congestion at Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Detroit. Hartford has only six switchmen out of one hundred at work. At all the gateways to the East thousands of cars with coal and foodstuffs are blocked—30,000 in New England, 100,000 in Chicago, and 2,500 in Cincinnati. Merchants are in distress because they cannot locate shipments that have been made to them and can form no estimate as to when goods in transit will be received. Neither the Railroad Brotherhoods nor the railroads see any immediate way out. There will be none until adequate wages are paid to the striking men and the Government helps to redeem the promises made a year ago as to their relief. Meanwhile the whole railroad system of the country, demoralized, undermanned, with a tremendous shortage of cars—226,000—to meet, and its financial future wholly undetermined, faces the most dangerous situation in its history. Fortunately, the government's "revolving fund" for the purchase of equipment is available for help if the Interstate Commerce Commission agrees.

SAN FRANCISCO'S School Board has issued an ultimatum to the city's school teachers that they must resign from the Federation of Teachers or be dismissed from the service. The teachers reply that the Board is mistaken, that the Federation is not a striking organization, and that, since such is not the case, there is no reason to ask them to leave it. Unfortunately, the word union suggests strike, and even more unfortunately the union and the fear of a strike seem to be necessary to bring teachers' salaries within hailing distance of a living wage. San Francisco's troubles are not unique. The Boston School Commission shilly-shallied about the pay of teachers at the Hub, and then protested when the teachers took their case direct to the Legislature. There are not many cities like Scranton, Pennsylvania, where the students in the Technical High School struck for a raise in their teachers' pay—though no doubt a very little propaganda would induce students to cut their classes to become strikers with as much enthusiasm as they have recently shown to become strike-breakers. School boards and city councilors will have to learn that repression is no cure-all, and that one way to avoid teachers' strikes is to raise teachers' salaries. A teachers' strike, if it brought about a wage sufficient to attract good teachers, might be less of an evil than the present situation, when thousands of children are forced on the streets daily because there are no teachers to teach them, and others suffer from perpetually tired and over-worked instructors. The sense of fidelity to public service which the teachers have hitherto shown is the really remarkable feature of the situation.

FOR years the National Women's Trade Union League and other women's organizations have urged that the special interests of working women be safeguarded through a Women's Bureau in the Federal Department of Labor. The war made the need for such a Bureau self-evident, at least for that emergency period, and this year the hope that the need would be seen as a permanent one seemed near fulfilment. Last week, however, on a point of order, Representative Blanton of Texas, arch-enemy of labor, had the appropriation for the Women's Bureau ruled out of the Sundry Civil Bill when it came up for action in the House, despite the fact that a bill putting the present Bureau on a permanent basis had already passed the House and was up in the Senate. The only saving chance for the Bureau now lies in the possibility of restoring its appropriation to the Sundry Civil Bill when it comes to the Senate. Friends of the Women's Bureau are asked to write to their Senators and to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, urging the reinstatement of the appropriation. If this action is not taken, the Women's Bureau bill will doubtless also be killed in the Senate, and the good beginning the Bureau has made, despite a meager budget, will go for nothing.

WHO is Representative MacCrate (New York) who dared to poke fun at the Attorney-General and who, with other Republicans in Congress, succeeded the other day in defeating a request by the Department of Justice for an increased allowance for the detection and prosecution of crime? Mr. MacCrate and others sought to learn why after declaring that W. Z. Foster was back of the railroad strike the Attorney-General had failed to arrest him; they were also ungracious enough to suggest that Mr. Palmer's repeated promises to lower prices were not a satisfactory solution of the high cost of living. Mr. Palmer, said Representative MacCrate, "has awakened class antagonism to a greater pitch than any preacher of class warfare. Whenever the country seems ready to settle down, and the national nerves are about normal, he breaks out crying: 'The republic is endangered.'" There is usually a brisk demand for mountebanks in America, but in presenting himself for the Presidency Mr. Palmer overlooked the fact that the market is rather oversold at the moment. The Red fire with which he began his campaign is likely to be a wisp of smoke and a black spot on the White House steps before Election Day.

AT the recent convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, diocese of New York, an attempt was made to revive the open forums that, under a ruling of Bishop Burch, have ceased to exist. The question was raised by the Rev. Percy Stickney Grant, rector of the Church of the Ascension, whose own open forum was lately attacked because of its radical tendencies. The charges were considered at the time by Bishop Burch, who decided that thereafter a list of topics and speakers must be presented and visaed in advance of every meeting, thus, of course, destroying the one essential of an open forum—the privilege of informal remarks from the floor. Through the assistance of men like the Rev. William T. Manning, rector of Trinity Church, who as volunteer army chaplain was recently telling people how blessed are the war-makers, the position of Bishop Burch was sustained. The debate was notable for rather more than the usual number of banalities, Everett P. Wheeler offering a resolution that "church edifices should be kept separate from all unhallowed, ordinary, common uses." To which we might suggest as addenda the words of Paul the Apostle: "But God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean."

WHENEVER the truth about Latin-American feeling toward the United States threatens to come to view, it is promptly "minimized" by the Government. General Pershing was recently held up in Panama by thousands of indignant natives protesting against the seizure by the United States of a large part of Taboga Island; the War Department "minimized" the importance of the affair and said that Panama appeared to misunderstand the motives of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States. This country merely intends, according to the War Department, to seize as much of Taboga Island as it thinks it needs, build fortifications on it, and then "compensate" the owners. There are countries, it is said, which resent having their territory seized even for compensation, and Panama appears to feel some such unreasonable objection to annexation. The Government of the United States would do better, when it seeks to take for its own everything which is not nailed down around the Caribbean, to use the method adopted in the case of Roncador Cay. By a Presidential decree, which the newspapers either thought unfit to print or did not receive, the United States in June of last year took possession of that island and reef—long claimed by Colombia—and asserted that as they were "not within the lawful jurisdiction of any other government" they would thereafter "be considered as appertaining to the United States." Doubtless Colombia will not fight the United States for its territorial rights; doubtless no other nation will bother about them. What else is needed to establish the claims of the United States to a small undefended island and as *the* fearless champion of the rights of small nations?

THE Turkish treaty will have little to do with the fate of Turkey, but it may mean much to the Balkans. The Allies have definitely turned their backs upon the old dream of a Balkan federation. The grant of all Thrace to Greece is a definite rejection of the just policy which the Allies ostensibly adopted last summer at the insistence of the American Government. The new treaty cuts Bulgaria off from the Aegean; it forces her to seek another commercial outlet, and, diverting her trade up the Danube, compels her to revert to commercial pro-Germanism. Nor can Rumania or Jugoslavia or Bulgaria contemplate with any assurance the new Greece which cuts ethnic frontiers and sprawls amoeba-like in all directions; the old Balkan jealousies are revived and coddled. Meanwhile, however, the Communists of the Balkan states have formed a Communist Balkan federation, and have profited by the general unrest. They have won municipal elections in Agram, the capital of Croatia, and in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria, and have even secured a following among the disaffected peasants. Jugoslavia is as much afflicted with strikes as Italy or France; the agrarian question is driving Rumania through a succession of cabinet crises; and it will be interesting to see what happens when the French troops are withdrawn from Bulgaria and Thrace, where their drastic methods have hitherto maintained a degree of order. Even in the Balkans, our diplomats are determined that it shall be a victory without peace.

FIFTY Irish police barracks wiped out in the single night of May 12-13 and, at the same time, twenty income tax offices robbed—this is a sample bulletin from Ireland. Apparently Sinn Fein has gone over to a determined policy of violence against the police, perhaps in the hope of so terrorizing them as to lead to a collapse of the organization. This is actually foreshadowed in a London dispatch. We cannot but think any policy of force, of robbery, and of destruction a great mistake, and one certain to react everywhere upon the Irish revolutionists. The fact, however, shows clearly to what lengths the Irish people have been driven and is proof how valueless the British military guard is in enforcing order. Already it is announced that these outrages will be answered by the guarding or replacing of policemen with soldiers everywhere. But this will not help at all. Indeed, it will only intensify the situation, which goes from bad to worse until the outlook seems almost hopeless. There is only one way in which disaster can be averted, and that is by England's coming forward with open hands, with the offer to withdraw her troops and to give Ireland the chance she seeks for self-determination.

PREMIER MILLERAND'S brave announcement that he was going to dissolve the General Confederation of Labor in France seems to have faded into a prolonged legal action the outcome of which will probably depend upon the political situation six or eight months hence. As an immediate solution of the general strike it has failed. It has neither cowed the strike leaders into submission, as was predicted, nor aroused the non-striking workers into anger, as was feared. Some sort of censorship is cutting down our news of this strike. Whether this censorship is deliberately exercised by the Government, or whether the strike has succeeded in crippling the cable service, we are not told. Bits leak through: we read that a strike-breaking bus driver, who wore an American army uniform, was not molested by the crowd—from which we assume that others were; we read of Chinese coolies replacing strikers in the Paris gas works, and of cavalry riding down insurgent crowds in various parts of Paris. We are daily informed that the railwaymen are flocking back to work, but we have learned to be suspicious of such news; and the correspondents agree that the dockers, seamen, and miners are staying out. France has never faced so serious an industrial situation; at a time when her ruined cities are crying for help, the arrogance of a few railroad directors has led her railroad workers into open revolt, and sympathetic strikes have brought the industrial life of the nation to a standstill. The issue in the strike is democratic nationalization of the railroads and mines; the occasion was the refusal of the companies to keep their promise to reinstate the leaders of the last railroad strike. Its solution will not be revolution if the moderate leaders of the Confederation of Labor can help it, but an attempt to dissolve their organization, or even a refusal to meet them half-way, is likely to play into the hands of the revolutionary leaders of the railroad union.

WITHIN a few weeks of the two major conventions there is in each party a confusion and uncertainty unprecedented in our modern political history. The Republicans have candidates a plenty, the Democrats have none. Neither has any issues. Their planks are likely to be platitudes—the time-worn timbers planed and sand-papered with a little up-to-date phraseology to look like new. There will be a League of Nations plank, but blessed if either Mr. Hays or Mr. Cummings or anyone else can say what the "convictions" of their respective parties will be on the subject. The Democrats are trying hard to shake off their Old Man of the Sea, who grows daily heavier and heavier and is nearly strangling the Democratic Sinbad. The equally distraught G. O. P., underneath a brave show of harmony, is worrying almost as much over the tactics of its radicals. The Socialists perhaps are to be envied. Their platform is largely cribbed from the classics, including the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, while their only candidate can be depended upon to stay put, for in his own words he is putting himself before the country as "a candidate at home in seclusion."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Allies' New War

ON the Russian-Polish front Polish soldiers dressed in American uniforms are beating back into Russia the armies of the Bolsheviki. American aviators, in spite of "unfavorable weather," are dropping bombs on the Russians. Ukrainian soldiers under General Petlura are fighting side by side with Polish troops, exchanging their birthright of "the rich oil district of Eastern Galicia," now Polish territory, for the assistance of the Poles in freeing the remainder of their land from the Bolsheviki. A new war is on.

The French—for the sake of Ukrainian wheat—have from the start been supporting the movement of the Poles; and the British, who were talking peace to the Poles only a few weeks ago, are now reported in devious negotiations to secure the cooperation of Finnish, Hungarian, Rumanian, and Serbian troops. Meanwhile the Germans, for the sake of internal peace and Allied favor, are said to be offering their reactionary military organizations, such as the Erhardt marine brigade, for the establishment of peace and democracy in Russia. America, too, is not missing. Not only are our aviators acting as volunteers in the service of Allied imperialism, not only are our uniforms clothing Polish troops on Russian soil, but our money is to be devoted to the same high cause. Indeed, where else could the new European war be financed but in the United States? The British budget carried no more than sufficient provision for Great Britain's private wars in the East to which she is plainly committed. The French are solvent only by grace of an all-obscuring patriotic camouflage. The Poles are insolvent by common consent. It would appear that a new war might be a hazardous undertaking for the Allies, whose people are in no mood to bow under heavier burdens. But America, apparently, is again ready to step in and save Europe from the danger of peace. A Warsaw dispatch of May 4, tells us that "eleven billion paper marks are to be printed shortly by the Polish Government. . . . The issue will be made possible by the loan which is to be floated in both American and domestic markets in the course of the next few weeks." What security will be offered the supporters of the loan? The promises of an insolvent Polish Government? Poland has only one security to offer—the spoils of a victory not yet won, the tribute to be exacted from a still undefeated enemy.

If the British Government should succeed in turning this campaign into a world war, it might indeed be that "last war" of which we have talked or at which we have sneered. The world cannot stand perpetual devastation; Russia would indeed be forced into ruin, but Europe would go down into ruin with her. The chances are, however, that things will not go so far. The armies of Russia have retreated before, and every retreat has led the armies of their enemies into untenable positions, cut off from their lines of communication, out of reach of their supplies.

Even now, when things look darkest for Russia in the press of its enemies, certain important factors need to be considered. Russia is in practical control of the Caucasus. Georgia and Azerbaijan have refused to fight the Soviets; Baku and the oil lands are in the hands of the Bolsheviki; the Armenians appear to be making overtures in the direction of Moscow. The British navy is bombarding with little effect the towns of the Crimea. Russia has a government and a policy to hold it together and an army fighting to defend its own land. The Allies have, instead of a government, the Supreme Council, which with a sort of malicious senility creates and recognizes nations which do not exist, establishes boundaries on paper, and renders decisions regarding accomplished facts. Their policy is a mixture of insane vengeance and cold-blooded greed. Their armies are bands of mercenaries who would have to starve if they did not fight. As Walter Duranty, writing in the New York *Times* recently, observed: "Poland has a big army which she does not dare to demobilize as there is no work to give to ex-soldiers. Although the maintenance of this comparatively huge force is straining the country's feeble finances to the breaking point, General Pilsudski evidently considers it wiser to keep the army busy against the Reds than either to disband it or [let it] eat its head off in idleness." The troops might proceed to Moscow, says Mr. Duranty; "the chief objection to their doing so is that it is not quite clear what they would do when they got there . . . and that every Russian, whether anti-Bolshevist or not, would be likely to oppose a Polish invasion to the utmost." In the light of recent history it is to be hoped that General Pilsudski is not lying awake on his army cot thinking up occupations to provide for his troops in Moscow.

Some day a history of Allied policy toward Russia will be written. It can be compiled largely from the questions in the British House of Commons and the answers or evasions of the British Ministers. It is a history that will make Bolshevists smile cynically, but will make honest men of milder faiths sick at heart. Beginning with the adoption of a policy of intervention—to be carried out without interfering in any way with the internal affairs of Russia—continuing through a war of invasion and aggression against Russia carried on with no declaration of war on the part of any government, it has come to a period of diplomatic bad faith which has been more disheartening than the period of open warfare. First Prinkipo, then the Nansen mission, then negotiations with the Cooperatives, then the official decision to open trade with Soviet Russia, then the scheme for a League of Nations mission proposed while Allied dollars were driving Polish soldiers into Russia—one after another these plans, conceived in fear rather than justice, were killed by a frenzied hope in some new military venture. Each time liberals supposed that the Allies must see the idiocy if not the brutality of their tactics. Each time liberals were to learn that there was no folly too great for governments to commit in the hope of gain.

A dispatch from Washington in the New York *Call* of May 13 states that within the previous week a memorandum calling for a renewal of trade with Russia was presented to President Wilson. The memorandum was said to have been signed by Secretary Colby and all the heads of the State Department bureaus, including the head of the Foreign Trade Bureau and of the Russian Division. The President has so far failed to act upon the memorandum. How long is the United States to connive in the throttling of the Russian people? How long are the leading men of the country going to approve by their silence our part in the shady diplomacy of the Allied Governments?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William Dean Howells

AS an author Mr. Howells was so prolific during the sixty years between his earliest book and his latest that he amounts almost to a library in himself. As an editor and critic he was so influential that he amounts almost to an academy. By the diversity of his achievements he, more than any other American, stands forth in our literary history as the man of letters par excellence—poet, essayist, traveler, editor, scholar, memoir-writer, dramatist, novelist, and in his lighter moments the producer of such book reviews and book introductions as make the calling of the literary hack nearly glorious. At his greatest height of fame in the years which saw him gradually transplanting himself from Boston to New York, he nevertheless maintained his eminence to the end with remarkable success, though of course the revolution in taste since 1890 has brought other and very different favorites to the front of the stage. What happened to him happened to Boston. After a period of splendor they both saw the eyes of America turn more and more frequently to new modes of culture which were less disciplined but more varied and vivid, less decent but more candid, less learned but more experienced, less amiable but more passionate. The difference between Boston and Mr. Howells is that Boston rested on the palms and laurels it already had, while Mr. Howells, so far as in him lay, rose to meet the new world. That he neither could nor would exchange his natural silver tone for the alternating sounds of gold and iron which dimmed the voice of Boston has in various quarters won him latterly some harsh words from critics in whom the propagandist was more strong than in Mr. Howells, whose temper kept him steadily a sage and an artist.

Regarding his art, indeed, there are no words but good words to be said. If he was not born with a flawless sense for form and style, at least he acquired it before he began to publish, and his hand never seriously wavered in all the tasks he undertook. As a sage he has been less universally approved. The more radical readers of his Utopian tale "A Traveler from Altruria," published in 1894, and of his account of his conversion to Tolstoy in "My Literary Passions," published the year following, looked for sermons and tracts from him which never came. Tolstoy had turned preacher, and why not his American disciple? The hasty conclusion was that he had only trifled with the doctrines of Christian communism which in Tolstoy had stirred him and that he timidly shrank from urging or defending them beyond a few gentle arguments and pleasant, fanciful pictures. The truer explanation is that the Tolstoyan doctrine actually taught Mr. Howells less than he realized himself; that it did little more than to make him conscious of moods and sentiments and opinions never yet thoroughly articulated in his spirit; and that at fifty he could hardly undergo any more considerable change than that his sympathies should be deepened and his utterance even further mellowed by the tides of benevolence and brotherhood which all his life had been rising within him and now knew themselves. "Tolstoy gave me heart to hope that the world may yet be made over in the image of Him who died for it, when all Caesar's things shall be finally rendered unto Caesar, and men shall come into their own, into the right to labor and the right to enjoy the fruits of their labor, each one master of himself and servant to every other. He taught me to see life not as a chase of a forever impossible personal happiness, but as a field for endeavor towards the happiness of the whole human family."

Tolstoy's way was impossible to Mr. Howell's will because Mr. Howells was a saint not of the other world but of this, a walker of sweet, companionable paths, too friendly for the naked solitude of the martyr, too kindly for the stinging battles of the natural warrior. Others might grow angry for the sake of increasing peace and goodwill in the world, but Mr. Howells could not. Others for the sake of humanity might desert an art for a mission, but Mr. Howells could not. In the many books he subsequently wrote he showed himself no less sunny and affectionate than he had been before. Old age never corroded him. But because in his later writings he never learned to be bitter against injustice, it must not be thought that he kept silence. No man spoke out more firmly or ringingly on behalf of the Chicago "anarchists," or against the annexation of the Philippines and the attendant frenzy of imperialism. And in his Altrurian romances he made no compromises whatsoever with the economic system under which he had been bred, but threw it as incontinently over—though how urbanely and serenely!—as the reddest of any of those who condemn him for his moderation.

Perhaps it was some lack of passion in Mr. Howells that made the surface of his work so smooth and so seemingly unaware of the clashing deeps of human character which he never visited. In this respect he recalls Jane Austen, whom he thought the greatest English novelist. Like her, he chose to portray his universe with little commentary except that which lurks in his irony, in a style which, as he said of hers, is "the elect speech of life expressing itself without pretending to emotions not felt, but finding human nature sufficient for its highest effects." Like her, too, he is hard to find conveniently distilled in a single masterpiece ready for transportation to posterity. Perhaps in time some half dozen of his books will have been winnowed out from the many, but as a whole, as an incomparable historian of his age, he has what Henry James saw in him, an "unfailing, testifying truth . . . which will keep you from ever being neglected. The critical intelligence—if any such fitful and discredited light may still be conceived as within our sphere—has not at all begun to render you its tribute. The more inquiringly and perceivingly it shall still be projected upon the American life we used to know, the more it shall be moved by the analytic and historic spirit, the more indispensable, the more a vessel of light, will you be found. It's a great thing to have used one's genius and done one's work with such quiet and robust consistency that they fall by their own weight into that happy service. You may remember perhaps, and I like to recall, how the great and admirable Taine, in one of the fine excursions of his French curiosity, greeted you as a precious painter and a sovereign witness. But his appreciation, I want you to believe with me, will yet be carried much further, and then—though you may have argued yourself happy, in your generous way and with your incurable optimism, even while noting yourself not understood—your really beautiful time will come."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Release of Youth

JOHN FISKE perceived that human history has been greatly affected by the fact that man has a longer infancy than the other animals. A creature which grows to its full stature and faculties in a few hours or weeks or months or even years has not the same opportunity to travel far in knowledge or to build its intelligence upon observations and conclusions as has the creature which normally matures through at least a score of years. There still remains to be studied the effect upon mankind of the deliberate prolongation of infancy which, particularly in Europe and America, has been going on for something over a century. Perhaps it should be called less a prolongation of infancy than a discovery that infancy actually lasts longer than had been realized. The social effect is much the same. In the eighteenth century the unproductive and acquisitive period of infancy for boys rarely lasted beyond twenty years, even for those who were trained at the colleges and universities. For the same class in the twentieth century—a class now proportionately larger than then—a period of twenty-five years is nearer the average. The shift is even more marked as regards girls, who a hundred years ago were likely to be married at seventeen or eighteen but who now are quite as likely to remain unmarried till twenty-five, and very many, of course, till later. What has become of those years of human life thus lost to adult society, or at least diverted to new purposes?

It will not do to answer that these years of youth have been offset by the years added at the end of life through the advance of hygiene and medicine. Even if the total number were the same—and there are no figures to prove or to disprove it—there would still be an incalculable difference in quality. Consider the matter in a simple biological aspect. The postponement of marriage has reduced the number of children born, and has therefore released for other functions a vast amount of human energy once devoted by very young women to gestation and lactation. Anyone who has had occasion to observe a group of girls in the schools and colleges of this generation knows how tremendous is the store of surplus energy for which there is no biological outlet and which too often fails to be sublimated as it might well be into other forms of service. The quantity of such energy which the war showed to be in reserve should not have been a surprise to the teachers or observers of youth. No more should it have been a surprise that those whom we thought of as mere boys should have suddenly and successfully taken up heavier labors and larger responsibilities than they had known before. The energy had been all the time in existence, though it had been spent on study or sports or dissipation. Thousands and thousands of years had instructed the race to give about so many years and about so much energy to youth, and the arbitrary customs of a century could not accomplish anything but the most superficial changes. The war, which wasted and worse than wasted human riches, almost certainly threw away a larger treasury of youth than any previous generation could have done, for the reason that there was more youth to throw away.

Looking back, we begin to realize that the splendor of modern life, its variety and glitter and color and movement, capable even of blinding us now and then to the drabness of its machine-processes, must have been due in part to the prolongation of infancy. There were longer hours for play and more ways of playing: new games, new dances, new contests of speed and strength and dexterity, and in America especially an increasing return to the mimic wild-life of the summer camp. It is indispensable that peace be made to give us back that abundance of youth. We need no increase of the birth-rate to absorb the energy of girls; we need no new wars to waste the energy of boys. We need instead to recognize this precious asset and employ it. The first step will be to distribute the fulness of life among more boys and girls than had it before the war, when it too often belonged to a narrow privileged class. The next will be to civilize it, not by cramping and restraining its activities but by associating them with thought and passion and beauty. In how many quarters of the world have athletics, the natural expression of the release of youth, been viewed as sheer rowdyism or at best as squandered power. But, viewed more largely, athletics must appear the physical symbol of the energy which the race has latterly been hoarding. Not athletics merely but the thing thereby symbolized must be drawn into the general current of existence. It means the enlargement of youth's pleasure, the evocation of its deeper thought and passion, the development of its capacities. And of course whatever enriches youth in time enriches all society.

Gasoline and Government

GASOLINE at thirty-seven cents a gallon? What are we coming to? Sugar and meat may soar, and milk too; the price of clothes may evoke thoughts of denim, yet the world still goes about its business. But gasoline at thirty-seven cents! Well, it's impossible; it's incredible. It incites to lawlessness. Why, if, as the daily press asserts, gasoline goes to fifty cents in September, and will be hardly obtainable at that, we look for revolution—that's all. We never did care much for this man Wilson anyway. But why isn't he on the job now? Where's his Flying Squadron that is supposed to deal summarily with gougers in the necessities of life? Where is Judge A. B. Anderson with his ever-ready injunction? Why is A. Mitchell Palmer wasting his time on Reds? Why is he not striking at the profiteering trust that aims to corner the one essential fluid next to water? Does he want to see mobs of goggled motorists tearing up paving stones and smashing the windows of every federal office? Let him beware. Stranger things have happened when strong men were driven to despair by the loss of their jobs. And what garage will keep open if gasoline goes to fifty cents?

Garage? Well, it won't be only the garage that will count. How will the painter, the plumber, the carpenter, and the bricklayer go to their jobs if their Packard limousines become as idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean? As for the doctors and the nurses—what if ambulances and runabouts are no more to be had? Motor-cycle policemen we can well spare; but who can indulge himself in a well-insured fire if there is no gasoline to feed the red engines and the hook and ladder? And the farmer? Why, if he cannot run his tractor or take his eggs and milk to market on the back seat of his Ford with piggy and baby beside him on the front, food in our cities will be at starvation prices in a week. What, we ask, would city life be like without the fragrance of gasoline, the thin blue veils of smoke,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hum of the gears, or the purr of the well-fed motors? As for the country roads, the pestiferous pedestrian, long since driven to cover, would reappear with sleek satisfaction writ full large upon his face, and mumble his usual idiocies about the flowers and the kids now getting a chance. Let Heaven's will be done, say we, but if *this* comes to pass—take heed, masters!

Hence we, as patriots and upholders of the Constitution, demand that the Government take over all the oil business. Not that we are Socialists. Heaven forbid. Trotzky and Lenin, too, are anathema to us. "Politics should keep its hands off private business" has been our slogan ever since we dropped our first dollar in the new till under the counter. But this is different. When it comes to "gas" at fifty cents, why the state *must* step in. Here's Governor Smith of New York declaring his State must take over the milk business to save the babies' lives. Water, he says, is regulated by the municipalities and almost every other drinkable by State or Nation. Why not one fluid more? Why not the *one* fluid that makes the motor world go round; whose very drops are the touch of nature that makes the whole world spin?

An Americanized Socialist Party

"RATIONAL Element in National Convention Overcomes Violent Extremists," said a headline in the New York *Sun* in describing the victory of the conservative forces at the recent gathering of the Socialist Party in New York City. Such a description, attributing sense to a majority of the delegates to the convention, comes oddly from this newspaper, especially when one considers that prominent among the leaders of the conservative forces were Morris Hillquit, whose anti-war platform in 1917 the *Sun* has so unsparingly denounced; Victor L. Berger, whose rejection by Congress it applauded; and Charles Solomon, whose non-admittance to the New York Assembly it justified.

Yet the *Sun's* respectful treatment of the recent convention was characteristic rather than exceptional so far as the press as a whole went, and illustrates both the publicity value for the Socialists of the Lusk and Sweet persecutions in New York State and the avidity with which the old-line forces of the country seize upon what looks like a tendency on the part of radicalism to clip its own wings. Deeper than either of these things also is the evidence that radicalism has progressed sufficiently in America in the last three years so that when the Socialist Party reverts to what is virtually a pre-war statement of principles the metropolitan newspapers receive it, if not with approval, at least with tolerance.

In the circles of radicalism itself the stand taken by the Socialist Party in its 1920 national convention is regarded by many as very pale pink, and they are right when the position is judged by various other declarations made in this country and elsewhere in the course of the last three years. The fact seems to be that American Socialists have completed a cycle since the United States entered the World War in 1917. The platform of that year was specifically an anti-war document, American Socialists sharing with those of Italy the distinction of having opposed from the start the entrance of their country into the international charnel house. The result was a genuine renaissance for the Socialist Party, and thousands voted under the Torch in the autumn elections of 1917, impelled by the war issue alone.

Then came the amazing events in Russia, and the rise of the Soviet Republic profoundly affected radicals and liberals of every shade in America as well as elsewhere. For the Socialist Party in America the year 1918 may be described as one of inspiration. For the first time the phraseology of Marxian socialism became current in the United States, but the ideology remained exceedingly hazy. Some persons were inspired but more were frightened by words and concepts that they only half understood. The policy of the Allies—ably abetted by the Wilson Administration—of shutting off communication with or knowledge of the most interesting political experiment of the centuries added to the mystery and misunderstanding. Inside the Socialist Party a cleavage began to appear, and the year 1919 was one of dissension, ending finally in the organization of the Communist and Communist Labor parties as offshoots.

But the new parties have found it difficult if not impossible to live. For this official repression has probably been less responsible than public opinion—a sentiment aided, it is true, by partisan and false official propaganda, but none the less founded on certain American beliefs that it is not yet possible to shake.

Meanwhile the Socialist Party has moved back toward its stand in 1917, a not unnatural recoil of the too violent explosions of 1919. The most significant aspect of the platform and principles of 1920 is their Americanism. "Dictatorship of the proletariat," "class war," and other phrases of international socialism are conspicuously absent. Even the previous declaration of solidarity with Soviet Russia is modified. The immediate object, at least, seems to be the expansion of an American Socialist Party rather than the development of the Socialist Party in America as part of the international movement.

The tendency toward an Americanized party was to be seen in the make-up of the convention itself. In spite of the frequent charge that the Socialist Party is an alien organization, an analysis of the delegates printed in the New York *Times* showed that out of 156 persons all but four were citizens of the United States and only sixty were foreign-born. New York, which has been especially assailed as a hotbed of alienism, sent twenty-seven delegates, all of whom were listed as citizens except one, about whom there was no information. Fifteen of the delegates were recorded as born abroad, ten in the United States, and about two there was no information.

From the tactical standpoint the 1920 Socialist program may be well-advised. America is ripe for a third party, but not for one rooted in Europe. We were only grazed by the war that tore the vitals from others, and our intellectual state is no more like that of Europe than is our industrial condition. You can talk pretty radical doctrine to an average American audience these days, but you cannot label it. As long as you express what purport to be your ideas in your own words, you can rely on a measure of sympathy, but once you label the doctrine "Communism" or "Bolshevism," you have killed it. It is a question in many minds whether you can label it "Socialism" either, but that is a risk that the Socialists obviously must take, and a point that is apparently soon to be determined in the bid they are making to become the rallying point for a victorious third party.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Philander C. Knox—Dark Horse

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

"FOR a good many years now," wrote a Washington correspondent in 1908, "the demand for Philander Chase Knox has greatly exceeded the visible available supply. Mr. Knox is five feet five inches high and shares with Elihu Root the distinction of being our most highly finished domestic product. The incoming, like the outgoing, Secretary of State has made a specialty of brains. The thing Mr. Knox does best is to accomplish what he sets out to do. It has become a habit." Since 1901 Mr. Knox has been Attorney General in the Cabinets of McKinley and Roosevelt, Secretary of State under Mr. Taft, and twice Senator from Pennsylvania. During that time he has twice declined appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States and refused the Governorship of Pennsylvania. Just now Senator Penrose has put him into the running for the Republican nomination for the Presidency. The bulk of the press dismisses it as an impossible suggestion, and yet the idea persists, notably in Washington, so that the question arises whether there will not be a demand at Chicago for all the visible supply of Knox to lead the Republicans to a triumphant success.

Curiously enough, the reason for considering Senator Knox seriously is that he does appeal to both wings of the Republican Party. Because of his earlier record he ought to be anathema to the progressives, this "sawed-off cherub" as Mr. Roosevelt once dubbed him. But he has been fighting with the Irreconcilables in the battle over the treaty; as *The Nation* has already pointed out, he was the first Senator, after Mr. Moses, to denounce the Peace Treaty itself—the Treaty aside from the Covenant—and the pained comments which appeared in the conventional newspapers in our large cities showed how clearly they felt that he had been guilty of that terrible sin of being a traitor to his class and to his kind. It was, they admitted, beyond their comprehension that one so orthodox should actually be speaking up for the Hun. A pacifist might have done so or some miserable Socialist—but Philander Knox? Why, it was incredible.

But we have moved swiftly since then. Senator Johnson, another traitor, grows stronger hourly and may dominate the Convention. Senator La Follette, the arch-fiend of three years ago, has swept his own State triumphantly. The unexpected happened in Georgia, and Victor Berger expects to be the next Governor of Wisconsin. It is plainly a topsy-turvy world, and the plight of the orthodox as they witness all this and behold Senator Knox moving for what was practically a separate peace with Germany is one of the most amusing spectacles in a world desperately short of humor and sadly long of misery and death. The powers that be thought that they had it all arranged how things were to be after the war, and yet nothing will stay put—and Senator Knox comes perilously near giving aid and comfort to the enemy at home and abroad! It is just because he has in the main been with Borah and Johnson that there is the possibility of their accepting him as the candidate if there should be a hopeless deadlock in Chicago. Had he stood even where Lodge stands he would not be considered a possible dark horse. For Senator Johnson has more pledged delegates than anybody else, without counting Wisconsin's and Idaho's, which will be his. If the Convention were not so far off, if he had another six or eight weeks, he would, without doubt, have a complete veto-power in the Convention. It is an open question whether he has not got it now. He is to appoint the permanent chairman. Will Johnson have the power to choose the President if he cannot nominate himself? It begins to look so. The threat of a bolt, of a third party movement, will be a powerful club.

The truth is that as one's mind runs back over Mr. Knox's career, it is plain that there are two sides to him, that he has alternately appealed to conservatives and progressives. He was and for a long time had been of Andrew Carnegie's counsel when he took office, and Mr. Carnegie testified that he urged William McKinley to make Mr. Knox his Attorney General at the same time that he put Mr. Reed, Mr. Knox's law partner, into the directorate of the United States Steel Corporation. But if Mr. Carnegie, or anybody else, expected that that would make things comfortable for big business, he experienced some sad shocks. When President Roosevelt asked Mr. Knox if the elder J. Pierpont Morgan could not be omitted from the list of the defendants to the Government's suit against the Northern Securities Company, Mr. Knox replied: "Well, Mr. President, if you direct me to leave his name out, I will do it, but I want to say plainly that in that case I will not sign my name to the bill. I do not propose to have the lawyers of the country laugh at me." Mr. Morgan became one of the defendants, and Mr. Knox signed the bill. During this same episode, this corporation lawyer, whose practice was said to net him $350,000 a year before he entered public life, had the nerve to tell the firm of Morgan over the telephone that "the stock ticker did not tick in the Department of Justice." Previously, in 1897, he had shocked his corporation clients by a speech in which he boldly asserted the then new and revolutionary doctrine that the Government has the right and power to control great combinations of capital; and when he entered Mr. McKinley's Cabinet he warned the President that he would make it his business to test the value of the Sherman Anti-trust Act, which he felt was constantly violated. This from a man who, according to James J. Hill, had "cleaned up $600,000 in the organization of the Steel Trust"!

The historian of Mr. Roosevelt's Administration will not have an easy task to assay how much of the credit for the Roosevelt corporation policies belongs to Mr. Knox. It is certain that Attorney General Knox's Pittsburgh speech of 1902 ushered in a new era in the relations of the Government and the large corporations, which was bitterly resisted at the time by the latter. The Northern Securities case was started and won. The Beef Trust prosecutions were begun and the first moves made against Standard Oil. It was because he was particularly the agent of Roosevelt that his nomination as President was urged by a number of newspapers in 1908. It may well be asked now how effective this anti-trust campaign really was. Not only have the dissolutions of the Standard Oil and other trusts failed to check abuses, but in the latest railroad legislation we are moving directly in the opposite direction from the Northern Securities decision. By many it has now been recognized

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that our economic evils call for much more radical remedies than the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. None the less, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Knox are still entitled to great credit for a course which, at the time, called for much personal and political courage. It is related that Mr. Roosevelt was once asked why he took a man who had had so much to do with organizing the trusts to control them. His reply was that he thought that Mr. Knox was just the man to do so because of his knowledge of them and their methods and the laws governing their incorporation.

One thing is certain: Mr. Knox was not afraid to talk back to his impetuous superior. Mr. Roosevelt once said in Mr. Knox's presence that the Attorney General could give a complete criticism of Gibbon's "Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire" in three hundred words. Quick as a flash came this retort from Mr. Knox "And of recent Presidential messages in less!" In the middle of the Panama theft—which Mr. Knox subsequently defended on the ground that the "interests of the world imposed upon this Government an imperative mandate to build the Canal"—the Attorney General was asked by Mr. Roosevelt for his advice. "I am sorry that you have asked for my opinion," replied Mr. Knox, "because, up to the present time, the proceedings have been free from any taint of law!" Later on, during the Progressive campaign of 1912, Mr. Knox naturally stood by Mr. Taft and said of his former chief, Mr. Roosevelt, that he would be defeated "unless the Republican Party has become the plaything of one man, prompted by his whims, his imperious ambitions, his vanities, and mysterious antipathies." On October 2, 1904, Mr. Knox had taken a very different view. Then he was defending him and found that Mr. Roosevelt was one "endowed by the Creator" with "high mental and temperamental qualifications for his great office," "a peculiarly fit public servant," who had achieved "lasting benefits to the nation and to humanity."

When Mr. Knox retired from the Cabinet in June, 1904, by appointment of the then Governor of Pennsylvania to take the place made vacant by the death of Senator Quay, it was declared by the Pittsburgh *Times* that it cost three corporation magnates $500,000 to have him appointed. They wanted him out of the Cabinet because he was too effective against the trusts, and so they took up notes to that amount held by the estate of the then recently deceased Henry W. Oliver, of Pittsburgh, against the managers of the State machine. The Pittsburgh *Times* was careful to state that Mr. Knox had no knowledge whatever of this transaction. It was charged that the money was put up by A. J. Cassatt, John D. Archbold, and Henry C. Frick; and James J. Hill had no hesitation in declaring that "Knox was made Senator of Pennsylvania by the eastern railroads." But here again, Mr. Knox must have disappointed those who backed him, because he was the leader in the Railroad Rate Bill fight of 1906, being the author of the Senate bill to bring the railroads completely under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the matter of fixing rates, with, however, the right of a court review.

Since international affairs are almost the most pressing which confront the United States today, Mr. Knox's career as Secretary of State becomes of especial importance if there is even a faint possibility of his being the Republican candidate. He is primarily the author of what is called "Dollar Diplomacy," and he is proud of it. Indeed, he wrote an article for the *Saturday Evening Post* of March 9, 1912, defending his course and explaining exactly what the Department of State under his guidance sought to accomplish. It had, he said, "found opportunity to advance the commercial interests of the American people in foreign markets, to encourage the use of our abundant means in assisting less forward countries to develop their resources and to advance reforms necessary to national stability and progress in regions aspiring toward a higher civilization." The promotion of American commerce he felt to be "one of the first duties of American diplomacy," and he was very happy to point out that, with an export trade at that time of over two billions of dollars, the total cost of the Department of State and of all of our foreign representatives in 1911 was only $1,760,000. But he defended his policy from the charge of pure materialism by declaring that he had prevented or terminated a war between Ecuador and Peru, a war between Haiti and Santo Domingo, one in Honduras, and had headed off wars in Costa Rica and Nicaragua. More than that, he took just pride in asserting that:

> In a regime styled dollar diplomacy, an American President has taken the world's greatest step toward universal peace through the French and British arbitration treaties. During the same period, through our new treaty with Japan, the so-called Japanese immigration question, at one time so troublesome and by many declared impossible of solution, has been settled permanently and satisfactorily. There have been more resorts to arbitration and more peaceful settlements of just claims and more brushing away of misunderstandings than seem to have occurred in any other corresponding period.

While the Japanese immigration question has not been settled, as Mr. Knox thought, and his intervention in Santo Domingo was wholly unsuccessful, it is not to be questioned that he had much to be proud of. The man who brought about our dangerous and improper financial intervention in Honduras and Nicaragua did, none the less, sign the great arbitration pacts with France and England—had there been one with Germany history might have been very different. It was Secretary Knox who preceded these treaties with a circular note to all the great powers asking them to set up and support an international court of arbitral justice at The Hague, to have jurisdiction of practically all questions arising between countries. He believed that the establishment of this court would reduce armaments, and he was bold enough to believe, with many pacifists, that its decrees and decisions would be carried into effect merely by the force of the enlightened public opinion of the world. He felt that the court would speedily build up a code of law applicable to all cases by its own decisions based upon the fundamental principles of international law and equity. It is important to bear this in mind now, because Senator Knox has not been merely destructive in his opposition to the wicked treaty of Versailles, but has had some such plan as this in mind throughout his opposition to the treaty. He wants to build an international court today as much as ever; he believes in international justice, and he wants war outlawed *now* and not a hundred years hence. His was a noble conception in 1910. What would not the Central Powers give now to have such another chance to safeguard the world against the horror which will forever stand charged against them!

One of the very great advantages, by the way, of the Knox arbitration treaties is their substitution of a clearly and accurately defined jurisdiction in place of the vague and indefinite terms of the then existing pacts. Mr. Knox insists that under these treaties neither the honor nor vital

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests of the United States can be imperiled unless we assert them against another nation's rights. Yet he put our financiers into the Central American countries, partly as a result of which our naval guns dominate the political life and subordinate the liberties of Santo Domingo, Haiti, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras. In several of these countries, our "big business" is gobbling lands and natural resources in a way to store up trouble for generations to come both in America and in those lands. Yet the thought behind Mr. Knox's activities was this, to quote him exactly: "If this Government can help to upbuild its neighbors and promote the thought that the capital of the more advanced nations of the world would be better employed in assisting the peaceful development of those more backward than in financing wars, it is such a deviation from traditions as the American people will approve." He has never been able to realize that more than half the trouble in the world today is due to this invasion of the backward countries of the earth by dollar diplomacy, and that with the dollar inevitably comes corruption, the theft of government from the backward people, and the subjecting of them to the control of foreign conquerors—conquerors either by the dollar or the sword and usually by both. Santo Domingo is the clearest illustration of this. We went in to help and to aid in the administration of the customs. We have wound up by pulling down the government, and enforcing our rule throughout the country contrary to the wishes of the people, with no more moral right to do so than the Germans had the day they crossed the Belgian boundary.

So we have the contradictory in Mr. Knox again. As he was the author of the arbitration treaties and as he urged the international court which the world must and shall have, and then made American capitalists masters in Central America, so he tried to induce Russia and Japan to neutralize the Manchurian Railway, and then turned around and joined the Six-Power group for the financial exploitation—and aid—of China. President Wilson promptly took us out of the Six-Power group declaring—how odd it sounds!—that there should be "no entangling foreign alliances even in respect to arrangements for supervising the financial compacts of weaker governments . . . the responsibility of the United States in the Six-Power group is obnoxious to the principles upon which this Government rests." (That master of inconsistencies, Mr. Wilson, is at this very moment joining the Four-Power group to do the very thing for China which Mr. Knox proposed and the President denounced in the above language.) Mr. Knox was always friendly to the Japanese and the Chinese. A group of reporters once asked him whether he favored a war with Japan. "I do favor it," he replied, "provided, however, that there are no soldiers on either side except newspaper reporters." He is emphatically an enlightened imperialist in a day in which all imperialists should be forever taboo. The London *Times* once remarked that there was a marked conflict "between the American people's high ideals of humanitarianism and justice, their ready response to any noble cause, their almost quixotic impulses of altruism and the inevitable result in practical politics of their vigorous nationalism and ambitions of expansion." Under the false liberal, Woodrow Wilson, it is precisely this conflict of aims and impulses which has got the United States into such trouble both abroad and in the Caribbean. Sometimes one asks whether, until we reach the day of the square deal in international relations, we should not be better off in the hands of an honest imperialist than of a dishonest liberal. At any rate, if Senator Knox becomes President, it is perfectly plain what kind of a foreign policy we may look for from him—a combination of high idealism and of commercial invasion of other people's lands, of financial exploitation of the backward in the honest belief of a Pizarro, or a Cortez, or a Clive that thus the will of the Lord is best served.

He is an interesting figure, this Mr. Knox, with his extraordinarily calm and controlled, almost mask-like countenance. His dark eyes are at times cold and piercing. Dressed to the part, he would seem the perfect type of political cardinal of the days when the worldly guidance of Italy was as much a part of the Vatican's activities as the spiritual. Mr. Creelman once described him as having a "passionless mind . . . uninspired by moral emotion; a just and loyal man but coldly averse to civic crusades." But Senator Knox has not been without a just passion of indignation against the treaty during the past year, against its impracticality, its dangers, its hypocrisies, its positive wrongs. Once more he has broken with his old corporation and financial associates. Once more he has been willing to jeopardize his own political future. Not as a matter of impulse, of course. Mr. Knox is not impulsive. His mind works clearly, logically, and analytically. Thus his recent speech on the state of peace in support of his resolution is extraordinarily compact, lucid, and clear, with the logical arrangement of the trained lawyer. The minds of these able lawyers like Knox and Root work similarly. They *are* "highly finished domestic products"—but usually they serve the interests of some rather than the interests of all.

With Mr. Knox thus explained by his record, is it not plain that if Borah and Johnson and their irreconcilably progressive associates and followers are to name a Republican candidate other than Johnson, Senator Knox might easily be more palatable a dose than General Wood, the utterly dull and unenlightened, or Nicholas Murray Butler, or Governor Lowden, or Senator Harding? The latter, however much they might appeal to the Old Guard, could get none of the votes that have sent Johnson to the front in the pre-convention fight. Mr. Knox might get many and, as Senator Penrose's statement proves, the Old Guard is still willing to take Knox even if he has kicked over the traces; even if he did turn "trust-buster" when it was supposed that he would stay hitched.

Of course, it is finally to be pointed out, that on all the great social issues, on the vital questions of labor and capital, Mr. Knox has either not expressed himself at all or voted with the standpatters. If he has a program for domestic social reform, or a plan for our economic regeneration, the world is as yet ignorant of it. In that he is but on a par with all the other candidates—more or less. Nor has he made any fight for our gravely jeopardized personal liberties or the Constitution which is daily spat upon by the constituted authorities sworn to honor and respect and enforce it.

The Truth About Leonard Wood

In the next issue of THE NATION, Mr. Villard will set forth the *truth* about Leonard Wood—and what he represents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Happened in Mexico

By LUIS LARA PARDO

GUSTAVE LE BON'S words: "Governments are not overturned; they just commit suicide," pretty well describes the downfall of Carranza. It was mainly of his own making. It was inevitable the minute he decided to violate the Mexican Constitution, to run counter to his own solemn pledges, and to nullify what promised to be the first real presidential contest ever held in Mexico.

Carranza became the head of the Mexican Government through a revolution dedicated to the establishment of "free election and no reelection." He was elected with a Constitution which absolutely forbade the President to run again for office or to interfere in any way with the popular vote. In order further to safeguard against the imposition of a government candidate, the Constitution provided that no officer of the army, no member of the cabinet and no high official of the Government could run for President while holding his official position.

Carranza's election as constitutional President was uncontested. He had been the leading figure in the overthrow of Huerta. The revolutionary groups were united at that time in the common cause, and there was no opposition party. As the end of the four-year term approached, however, new political groups formed, and aspirants for the presidency appeared. The most conspicuous was Obregon. He had been Carranza's right-hand man throughout the revolution, and unquestionably the foremost military genius of the period. He was a great soldier, yet not essentially militaristic. The emergency ended, he retired from active service, obtaining an absolute discharge from the army. For the three intervening years he has engaged in business in his native state of Sonora. As early as July, 1918, he formally announced his candidacy, then proceeded to organize his party and undertake, at his own expense, an active political campaign.

The first inkling that the course of constitutional government would not run smooth came from statements of various of Carranza's friends. These alluded to the dangers of a political campaign, and suggested that in the interests of stability, the best solution for Mexico was that Carranza should continue in power indefinitely. These semi-official statements were ill-advised. They created distrust which Carranza's repeated announcements that he had no ambition to succeed himself, did not allay.

Moreover, Carranza did not refrain from interference in events bearing upon the election, as he had promised to do. He interfered not only in an advisory capacity, as the nominal head of a large political party—which, however, existed no longer, as it had served its purpose and had split into different groups. He interfered by force of arms. In a few states where elections had been held, he sent troops to aid the party sympathetic to him, and in some instances actually went so far as to unseat, by military interference, a duly elected Governor.

By the end of last year, Obregon had achieved a fairly good political organization. With it, he entered the municipal election in Mexico City, second in importance only to the presidential contest. His party went to the polls and an orderly election appeared to be taking place. But just before closing time men in automobiles went to the polling places and removed the ballot boxes by force. The count was made secretly by agents of the Federal Government. The announced returns, given officially, showed a victory for the Government. In vain Obregon's men raised the cry of "robbery." The Federal Government declared its own aldermen elected. Political excitement ran high. But Obregon calmed the hot-heads, advised his friends to abide by the decision, and to continue their political activity in the presidential campaign.

Up to that time, only two candidates were serious contenders—Obregon and General Pablo Gonzales. Carranza was suspected of desiring a third candidate of his own. For some time he had been strengthening his party fences, using the full machinery of the Government for that purpose, and finally summoned Ignacio Bonillas, then Ambassador to Washington, to return home. From every point of view, the move was unwise. Bonillas was a prominent citizen of Sonora—Obregon's home State—and this was probably an important factor in Carranza's choice. But Bonillas had not been closely identified with the administration. He was without popular prestige. He was practically unknown to the majority of the people. In any open and fair contest between him and Obregon, there could be no question as to the outcome. Whatever Carranza's motives and intentions may have been, whether he was actuated by a sincere desire to pursue the course that seemed to him best for Mexico, he was at least guilty of grave errors of judgment. It was suspected that his purpose in dragging out Bonillas and foisting him upon the country was to incite violence, and take advantage of the situation to maintain himself in power by military force. Carranza's actions confirmed this belief. No sooner had Bonillas reached Mexico City and accepted the nomination, than all pretense of neutrality and merely political activity on the part of Carranza Government vanished. Every official of the Government showing sympathy for Obregon was either discharged or transferred, and every effort was made to obstruct the already irresistible onward march of Carranza's former commander.

Meanwhile, Mexican labor lined up squarely behind Obregon. The newly formed labor party held a convention at Zacatecas, with nineteen of the twenty-seven Mexican States represented. Its platform contained this plank:

"As it appears that preparations are being made to defraud the people of their right to express their free will during the coming national elections (July, 1920), if it be necessary the Labor Party will employ all of its moral and material strength to prevent the hopes of the working people from being defrauded in the coming political struggle."

The Convention of Labor Unions held recently at Tampico, far from the influence of the Carranza Government, considered the merits of the three presidential candidates impartially. It summoned all three of them to discuss their platforms before the convention, and after long deliberation decided for Obregon. This gave him the unqualified support of the railroad men, the most powerful labor organization in Mexico.

Obregon and his men continued to campaign. They were impatient, and showed clearly that they would not tolerate further tampering with the popular will. By this time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Carranza faced the alternatives of yielding or of going the limit in his persecution and facing the consequences. He chose the latter. In the middle of the campaign he commanded Obregon under threat of arrest to come to Mexico City in order to keep him under watch. Carranza then dispatched troops to those states which were not under his personal control, and where Obregon could claim a plurality in the election. The subsequent facts are well known. Sonora rejected military interference and revolted. It was not a militaristic coup. On the contrary it was rather a civil revolt against military oppression. It was initiated by the civil governor and the Legislature. No "man on horseback" was visible.

The rapid overturn, the great success thus far, of the revolt is due primarily to the attempt of Carranza to break down the constitutional guaranties which he himself had promised to erect and strengthen. As such the movement is a hopeful symptom, even if it involves for the time the tragic downfall of a constitutional government. Back of this was Carranza's lack of personal popularity and dissatisfaction with many of his measures. He has never been loved, though pretty generally respected by his people. He has been considered a strong man, and until the present, level-headed. His economic policies have not been successful. He made vain attempts to flood the country with worthless paper money—to change Mexico, a producer of gold and silver in large amounts, into a country of fiat money. He destroyed the banks, without providing for a credit system. Money scarcity was a serious handicap to business. It affected not only large business, but the public in general, because he failed to provide for the needs of the retail trade. Another serious charge is that he did not keep his entourage free from objectionable characters. His administration tolerated much immorality. This Obregon promised to correct, if elected.

The future is not as yet clear. It depends upon many circumstances. Carranza is obstinate. So long as he has a group, no matter how small, of supporters, he will claim the presidency. He may obtain support from different quarters and resist for a time. Discord may arise in the ranks of the victorious groups, before or after the election which their leaders are pledged to call. The evidences are, however, that the people have spoken and that Obregon has displaced Carranza.

The real, the greatest danger, lies in outside interference. If left to themselves, the Mexican people will have an opportunity to work out the kind of political organization which accords with their needs. They are capable of progress, and they have accomplished much, even in the midst of civil war. They will find their way much more easily and more certainly by themselves, than under the duress and dictation of a foreign power, no matter how great, how well meaning, how altruistic, and how idealistic. Certainly all believers in democracy wish them that opportunity to the fullest extent.

The Situation in Sonora

By MARY AUSTIN

IN Sonora at the present hour, a thin skim of political intrigue is being made the excuse for, at the same time that it masks, conditions analogous to the Middle-European cleavage. The situation has its roots in tribal differentiations—notice I don't say differences—which time has been all too short to unify. It finds its modus in the loose federation of the Mexican States, and its occasion in the Latin-American temperament.

What Serbia is to the Balkans, what Ireland is to the English, Sonora has been to Mexico. The state is about the size and of the same geographical constitution as Arizona, rich in undeveloped stores of silver, lead, copper, and gold. Planted in its most fertile valleys are some 60,000 Indians, nearly related to our own Indians of the Southwest.

Of these five or six thousand are tribal remnants, Apaches, Pimas, and Papagoes, twenty to twenty-five are Mayos, and the rest Yaquis. These Yaquis are to other Indians as the Highland clans were to the Lowlanders for general hardihood and pride. Surrounded by whites since 1533, it is their boast that they have never been subdued and never paid tribute. Eight times they have risen against the Government, the last time in 1901, and so brought on themselves the terrible punishment of prerevolutionary days, deportation in thousands to the fever stricken districts of Tehuantepec and Yucatan. The Carranza revolution brought them release from persecution, but could not rid them immediately of their tribal habit of being "agin the government." It also brought them the conditions faced by our own Indians; the desire of their rich lands on the part of the more Mexicanized population. No such accomplished instrument of imposition as our own Bureau of Indian affairs has been turned against them, but the constant menace of usurpation keeps them disaffected.

The Yaquis are not to be thought of as constituting an organized center of rebellion. They have not even an organization of tribal government, and no leader in their previous revolts but the self-elected *capitán* of their tribal spirit—a spirit so fired with sympathy for all resistance to imposition that I was told by several Yaquis whom I met along the border last winter, that within a year after the invasion of Belgium, the Yaqui nation solemnly considered itself in a state of war with Germany. Chiefly by crossing over into Arizona where the excellent wages they command—a Yaqui can do twice as much work as any other Indian—enables them to invest in the latest models, they manage to keep themselves supplied with rifles and ammunition.

But the Yaquis have not been alone in Sonora in a state of suspended disaffection toward federalization. Governor Adolfo de la Huerta repeatedly declined several of Carranza's urgent invitations to come up to the capital and talk things over. In the matter of Asiatic colonization, to which the whole west coast is unfriendly, Sonora has shown a disposition to deal at first hand, without reference to the Federal Government. There have been anti-Chinese mobs, and even killings. These things, together with the imperfect federation of the Mexican States which makes secession a much simpler and less rending business than with us, constitute the day to day political life of Sonora.

About six weeks ago President Carranza became convinced that the Yaquis were again on the point of revolt. At once federal troops began to pour into the Sonora posts without the formality of an invitation from the State. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sonorans suspected a design to depose the civil government and set up a temporary military dictatorship. Certain political complications gave color to the suspicion.

On the first Sunday of July occurs the next Presidential election. Carranza, who will not be a candidate again, expected to throw his influence all to Señor Ignacio Bonillas, formerly ambassador to the United States. Señor Carranza was therefore extremely observant of General Alvaro Obregon who was known to have presidential aspirations. Recently Obregon has been detained at the capital on charge of being in communication with the rebel leader, Cejudo. Obregon is a Sonoran. So, for that matter, is Bonillas, but Bonillas was educated in America, has an American wife, and has resided for five of six years at the American capital. The Sonorans decided that President Carranza meant to prevent a free expression of their choice of Obregon for president, and finding their excuse in the sending of federal troops into the State, they seceded.

These are the bare facts. The rest is temperament, and the lack in Mexico, which can not be too often insisted upon, of a *competent method of social consent.* It must be constantly borne in mind that eighty per cent of the Mexican people have no use of the press and printed propaganda.

They are seldom able to read their ballot, are only slightly acquainted with its use, and have the same reasons our Negroes in the South have had to distrust it. On any occasion where mass opinion needs expression, the Indian part of the population finds the simplest, most natural, and most effective expression is in *mass movement.* They get together bodily because they have not yet learned any better way of publicly enforcing their united wills. The secession of Sonora is a "make Obregon president" movement, for political significance comparable to some of the favorite son campaigns now going on in the United States.

Inevitably it has been taken up by Pablo Gonzalez and some other disappointed candidates. It easily spreads in the unstable medium of imperfectly amalgamated peoples, until it ends as now seems indicated in the somewhat hurried expiration of Carranza's term and the installation of a new president without the formality of ballot casting.

Note again that I do not say without an election, for, after all, what is an election but an expressed intention? But for those of us who have an invincible preference for the ballot as a method of registering popular expression, nothing could be worse for the establishment of such a method in Mexico than the exaggeration and misreading of the situation in the American press. Whether it is done ignorantly, or deliberately in the hope of bringing about such a situation as enabled us to snatch the territory of Texas and California from old Mexico, it is putting a spoke in the wheel of democracy and self-determination.

To teach Mexico the use of the ballot and an orderly and periodic expression of political preference, is a business requiring time and tact. There is, indeed, a question whether the fixed governmental term is best suited to the Latin-American temperament. There are a great many people in the United States who are beginning to think that it is not the best system for us, and that a government ought to fall, or to be recalled, as happens in England, the moment it ceases to express the will of the majority. People who are disposed to see in the Sonoran situation evidence of a "weak" central government, should ask themselves whether it is any weaker than a deadlock of irreconcilable legislative and executive intentions.

Ideas and Men in Mexico

By ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

IN the Mexican situation there are ideas and there are men. There are three ideas working in Mexico: first, the idea of the past, that Mexico must be governed by a puppet despotism of which the wires are pulled by foreign interests. This idea is held by nobody in Mexico proper. It is the idea of the emigrés of the Diaz and Huerta regimes. It is the idea of the foreign speculator in the Mexican field. It is the idea of some legitimate business men who see their profits threatened by even a moderate realization of the promises of the Revolution. It is the idea of Europeans and of various groups in the United States, jingoes in part, schemers in part, in part honest patriots, swayed by Mexican outrages against American citizens, and by the conviction that it is the duty of the United States to impose American honesty and efficiency upon the whole Western World. In terms of force, this idea was represented in Mexico, before the recent revolution, only by scattered bands of rebels. There was one nucleus near Vera Cruz under Felix Diaz, and another nucleus near Tampico under the Palaez brothers.

There is the idea, also, of a republican constitutional democracy under a system of modified *laissez-faire* capitalism, implying the leadership of the middle class. In a mood of optimism, one might call this the Wilson, or even the American idea. In a mood of pessimism, one might call it the Kerensky idea. It is held in Mexico, first of all, by the middle class made up of ambitious business men who want to get rich by honest effort in fair competition under "law and order." The middle class is a new and relatively small element in Mexican life. Its propagandists have estimated it at from twenty to thirty per cent of the population. In terms of force, this idea is represented by the present Carranza administration. It was the idea which emerged triumphant from the Revolution, through Wilson's refusal to recognize and support Huerta. The Revolution itself was, however, the work of a combination of the middle class with the agrarians and extremists, who, in the war against Huerta, furnished decisive contingents to Carranza.

There is, finally, the idea of social revolution in Mexico, the idea that in some way or other political control must rest in the hands of the laboring classes, industrial and agrarian as they may be. This is the idea, which by its appeal to from seventy to eighty per cent of the population, swept Diaz out of power. In terms of force it was originally represented by Zapata and Villa. It was a vague idea, hazy as to methods and even as to ideals. It expressed itself partly in the slogan of "the land to the peasants"—of which the political result would be a democracy resting on small proprietorships. But in concepts of land readjustment memories of ancient Indian communism were not without influence; and mingled in the idea also are certain inarticulate traces of an Indian nationalism. Under pressure of circumstance, this idea formulated itself in terms of a Socialistic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

republic in the Constitution of 1917. It was by putting themselves at the head of this idea that first Madero and then Carranza came into power. It won the Revolution under middle-class leadership, but there is an irreconcilable conflict between it and the middle class idea. The middle class and the proletariat in Mexico united for war purposes. As in Russia, as in Germany, the coming of peace meant the dissolution of that alliance. The revolutionary wave in receding left the middle class in power. The proletarian idea remains, in terms of force, first of all with Villa, who, as the grand old villain of a lost cause, ekes out an outlaw's existence in the mountains of Chihuahua. It remains, legally constituted and tacitly tolerated in the state of Yucatan, under the farsighted and astute leadership of Felipe Carrillo. It remains everywhere as a political slogan and a campaign watchword. By virtue of it, various state governors, often ostensibly obedient to Carranza, maintained a precarious independence under the Mexico City government.

Now, if the ideas operative in Mexico are three, the men operating there are very numerous. A catalogue of them would fill a page. Let us take them rather as a class. They are "new" men, men who have become prominent largely by military or public service during the Revolution. They are adventurers all, or nearly all, of them. They fall into categories which are the categories of the military hierarchy. They are generals of division; they are brigadier generals; they are colonels; they are captains. The colonels and the captains are few; for these men soon promote themselves to the rank of general, by taking to the hills when a chance to make trouble offers. In some cases they are not military men, but men from the civil service, governors of states, cabinet ministers, consuls and secretaries. In the melee of individual ambition let loose in Mexico during the great upheaval, there was a division of spoils between the military leader who received the graft and the civil official who permitted it. It was not a fair division: the military men got the lion's share of the booty.

The Revolution left in its track, among a host of good things, one great evil: the possibility of making a living by opposing the government as well as supporting it. One method of making a living is by robbery and banditry. Every revolution has seized the banks and, when successful, has refunded the booty from taxation. Another way is by graft. The general maintains an army of ten thousand men. He receives from the government money for the support of twenty thousand. He divides the proceeds with the official who audits the books, and devotes a part to presents to his soldiers, who become soldiers of the general and not of the nation. The Mexican army is a group of individual armies, following where their commanders go.

Now there was a government in Mexico. The Carranza government was an effort to realize a capitalistic democracy in Mexico, in the face of this struggle between ideas, and this rivalry between individuals. These were not its only problems. There was also the threat of conquest for one motive or another and with one object or another from the United States.

Carranza's government was a government with a democratic mandate from which popular support had been withdrawn. The one coherent element behind it was the honest, hardworking, prosperity-seeking middle class in Mexico, a class that is in a hopeless minority. The reason why popular support had been withdrawn from Carranza was that he had failed to carry out the extreme radical promises of the Revolution. The reason for this failure was, first, that he did not believe in them; but, second, to carry them out meant an attack upon vested foreign interests, and that attack would not have been tolerated by the United States. The threat from the United States was not wholly disadvantageous to Carranza. It gave him the opportunity to be vigorously anti-American, and to distract popular attention from the moderation of his land, subsoil and industrial policies by an appeal to nationalism. Carranza's anti-Americanism was, however, insincere. The middle class in Mexico, which he represents, sees its one hope in the support of the great American capitalistic democracy.

In these conditions, the Carranza government, lacking united popular support and lacking majority popular support, rested for its strength on the army; that is to say, on the various individual generals who lead and personally maintain contingents of armed men. The President's policy here was threefold: first, to give as much power in the army as possible to honest men; second, to attach as many adventurers as possible to allegiance to the government; third, to deprive of power, and even of office, adventurers disloyal to his regime or potentially capable of making trouble. It was a policy essentially opportunistic. It did not satisfy American Puritans for its tolerance of certain vices. It did not satisfy American imperialists, because it worked with a certain measure of success.

What progress, then, in recovering from revolution and in development toward stability, had the Mexican republic made? That was a question on which views in Mexico differ. It was the question on which the elections announced for July 3 were expected to throw definite light. It was the hope of the Carranza government to effect an orderly transmission of authority to a new administration elected by a popular vote more or less honest, but as honest as possible. An honest popular vote in Mexico would result in the formation of a Socialist republic. It was Carranza's problem to get a popular vote which would perpetuate a republic on the model of the United States.

In the elements supporting Carranza, two tendencies developed as to the means of accomplishing this result. One tendency held that the country was "revolution weary" and could be brought to support a civilian candidate, whose election would open the door to a thoroughgoing renovation of the army and its subjection to the civil power. The candidate proposed by this tendency was Ambassador Bonillas. President Carranza himself was variously reported as inclining personally toward this view.

The second tendency held that the middle class democracy must still depend upon the dominance of the army in the councils of the nation. The leader of this tendency was General Pablo Gonzalez, who owes his prestige to efficient suppression of rebel adventurers, such as Zapata, Blanquet, and others. Gonzalez is, however, a man who has not become any poorer as a result of the revolution.

What the Carranza government most feared was an appeal by one adventurer or another to the popular majority of radical tendencies in the nation which had to be brought to defeat itself at the polls, which furthermore is not self-conscious or committed irrevocably to any clear ideal, and which can, under certain conditions, be roused to arms. All the unsatisfied military ambitions in Mexico have in the course of the last year come to see that their one hope of gaining power lay in an appeal to this "suppressed majority," and in their union around one man. That man is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Alvaro Obregon, like Carranza, a hero of the Revolution, and like Gonzalez, a man grown rich on revolution.

For a time, and no one knows with how much sincerity, General Obregon saw a way to power through constitutional methods. A man of Rooseveltian candor and Vesuvian temperament, he began by putting himself at the head of all brands of discontent in Mexico. With the extremists he was an extremist, and his speeches have played over all the slogans of social revolution. But with the Diaz reactionaries he has talked loudly and emphatically about restitution, compensation, and amnesty. To shelter under the banner of Mexican nationalism he has joined Carranza in denunciations of the United States. To the disaffected Indian tribes he has talked Indian nationalism. His generous platform comfortably accommodates Felix Diaz on the right and Felipe Carrillo on the left.

But beginning with the past autumn, General Obregon had apparently begun to lose faith in the democratic methods of the ballot. His trip "around the circle" carried the message that Carranza was planning to influence the elections, and would use government power to continue the present administration. This kind of a campaign was susceptible of different interpretations. Its overt attack on the ballot-box method could mean that General Obregon, in the event of defeat at the polls, might contest the results by force of arms. This led to certain acts by Carranza which form the immediate background of the present revolution. The President, as head of the army, ruled that no general in active service would be allowed to participate in politics. Carranza was anxious to force an issue before election time, to prevent further consolidation of Obregon's influence.

The effect of this ruling on the disposition of forces in Mexico can easily be made clear. There are nine generals of division in the Mexican army. Four of them, Generals Cesario Castro, Jesus Agostin Castro, Manuel Dieguez, and Candido Aguilar, are Carranzistas. Two of them are Pablistas, or supporters of Pablo Gonzalez: they are General Pablo Gonzalez himself and General Jacinto B. Treviño. Three of them are Obregonistas: Obregon himself, General Salvador Alvarado, and General Benjamin Hill. The Carranza order caused the retirement of the Obregonist generals from active service, allowing them only one soldier apiece for personal service. Obregon himself had retired from active service three years previously. The two Pablistas voluntarily resigned to take part in the campaign of General Gonzalez. The active army was left entirely at the disposal of men loyal to Carranza. The "persecution" was carried also to the lower grades. Whenever a follower of Obregon was detected in the army, he was removed from command and his troops "distributed" to other loyal regiments. The announced intention of the government to replace the garrison in Sonora with loyal troops was a crucial test of the situation. That was an attack upon the sole remaining nucleus of power on which Obregon could rely. It was a measure well calculated to force the General to declare his intentions and show his hand.

Suspicion that General Obregon was planning a revolt was strengthened by the discovery of letters addressed to him by General Roberto Cejudo, a rebel chieftain under Felix Diaz. These letters, intercepted (according to the old government) by General Bertani, a Carranzista (forged according to Obregon), related to an "agreement" previously reached between Cejudo and Obregon. Questioned by a military tribunal as to the nature of this agreement, Obregon refused to testify. We now know that his arrest had been ordered. It was suspected in Mexico City that it was Cejudo's plan to surrender to Carranza on terms providing for the enlistment of his command in the government army and the recognition of his title as general. It was charged that he agreed to hold this army, thus replenished and equipped from the government budget, at the service of Obregon, should the latter decide to raise the standard of revolt. This is the same device attempted recently by General Arenas, who, however, took to the mountains "on his own" and, when captured, was shot. In any event, the advance of Carranza troops toward Sonora, and Obregon's subpœna in Mexico City, were the signals for the rising of the Obregonist troops under General Calles in Sonora.

In the last month events have developed rapidly. The tragic fact for Carranza has been the duplicity of Pablo Gonzalez. Gonzalez has emphatically protested his loyalty to the "peaceful transmission of power." He has posed dramatically on all occasions as a civilian and a "civilist." There is every indication that Gonzalez has long had an understanding with Obregon for a division of spoils and for the restoration of a military dictatorship. Certain it is that though Gonzalez has been identified publicly with administrative or "civilistic" theory, he accepted Obregon's veto on Mr. Bonillas in April and agreed that the next president must be a soldier. The immediate success of the revolt is to be explained rather by the clever public and secret campaign that has been going on since December last. The military and civil leaders in the provinces were marshaled under promises of a new division of spoils. The spirit of the radical peasantry was roused to new hope by Obregon's radical promises. In this latter respect the present overturn exactly parallels the spontaneous uprising against Diaz.

The natural mistake would be to take Obregon's radicalism seriously. In fact his propaganda in the United States has made just as lavish promises to reaction. As we have said, it is a question not of ideas but of men. And the immediate point in doubt is not whether Obregon will carry out the constitution of 1917 (as he promises his people) or prevent the execution of that constitution (as he promises Wall Street), but whether he can give General Gonzalez a sufficient share of the spoils to make it worth the ex-civilist's while to keep quiet. When Mr. Carranza has been finally disposed of the answer to this question will begin to suggest itself.

Contributors to This Issue

DR. LUIS LARA PARDO, formerly a member of the Mexican Congress, is a journalist of several years' residence in the United States, editor-in-chief of the Latin-American Year Book, and correspondent for several Spanish-American newspapers.

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON, formerly professor of Romance Languages at Columbia University, is a member of the staff of the Foreign Press Service.

MARY HEATON VORSE is a well-known novelist and short-story writer who has been deeply interested in American labor problems.

RONALD B. HOTSON is a member of the Anglo-American Mission of the Society of Friends.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers in Session

By MARY HEATON VORSE

DURING the whole of one dinner I listened to Sidney Hillman telling the dramatic story of the building up of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. In the span of a few years this organization has changed from a small group of insurgent idealists in a sweated trade to perhaps the most powerful labor union in America, with a membership of nearly 200,000, and which has in sight the complete organization of all the makers of men's clothing. He ended his story saying, "That is why I believe in Democracy."

He believed in democracy because he had seen it work. He had seen the organization of which he is president grow powerful through that cooperative thought and effort and sacrifice and idealism of many people which we call by the name of democracy. Sidney Hillman himself is a practical idealist. He knows that the most valuable possessions of any man are his dreams and ideals. On the other hand he knows what dreams are realizable now and which must wait for tomorrow.

At the Fourth Biennial Convention which took place in Boston from May 10 to May 15 you could see the spirit of practical idealism and of democracy at work. A peculiarly close communication exists between the leaders and the rank and file. One of the outstanding things in this convention is the fact that Sidney Hillman and Joseph Schlossberg, the secretary, are continually feeling out the meaning of the convention and interpreting its will. There is a current of communication between the platform and the delegates on the floor. You feel them thinking together, working together, until the whole convention is instinct with the vitality of creation.

Before it is possible to grasp the full significance of this convention, one must review the work accomplished by the Amalgamated during the last two years. The membership at that time did not reach 70,000. Now it is 200,000 nearly. Chicago is organized 100 per cent, Boston 85 per cent, Philadelphia 75 per cent, New York upwards to 90 per cent. The organization in Rochester and Utica extends north to Canada, and has organized Louisville in the South 100 per cent. At the last biennial convention the general office had $2,000. Now the treasury of the general office has $350,000, and that after having paid $100,000 in one check to the striking steel workers.

The Amalgamated has achieved a 44-hour week practically throughout the trade. It has perfected the best machinery existing in America for the settling of industrial disputes. It has developed an educational program and today it has eight newspapers. Wages, roughly speaking, have been raised 100 per cent. These facts must be translated in terms of the lives and happiness of human beings; thousands and thousands of people living under better conditions; thousands and thousands of children staying in schools where formerly they would have had to go to work.

There is an alderman in New York whose name is Vladeck. He is also a tailor, and he comes from the Williamsburg District, one of the poorest sections of the city. His account of that district is that the whole standard of living has been changed by the Amalgamated. During the convention he spoke in part as follows, and what he said is well to bear in mind for it is true all over the country: "There are more lectures now, there are more social clubs now, there is a greater and more sincere reaction to everything that is going on in the world than there ever was in the district before. This is why I want you to understand, you tailors and members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, that your work is not only work for your union, that your work is not only work for a certain membership, but it is work for these United States of America." It is small wonder that this same speaker looks upon the Amalgamated as a true agent of Americanism.

The convention in Boston reflected the same conditions. A large group of people had their whole economic position altered by organization. They had emerged from a sweated and exploited group so there was a deep spiritual significance in the fact that the Symphony Orchestra opened the convention; that flowers loaded the platform; that gifts were made to the officers. It was the people's way of saying, "We can at last have the beautiful things of life from which we were so long excluded." Four years ago the situation in Boston in this trade was a miserable one. There was no money; the general office had to pay the office rent for Boston. Now the Boston workers could finance a convention which in its spirit was more like a happy celebration than a business affair. The joy of victory was in the air without the mean joy of triumph over an enemy.

"How do you think you accomplished so much in so short a time?" I asked Schlossberg.

"It was through our idealism," he answered. "We had nothing but that to offer the people in the beginning."

The ideal of the Amalgamated is that of a better society—of an industrial democracy where production will be for the use and service of the many instead of for the profit of the few. They never lose sight of this goal. In the midst of a discussion of the practical issue of the day they look continually toward this horizon. You hear constantly repeated from the floor and the platform, "It is our vision of a better society, which is important. Shorter hours, higher wages, are good things, but they are incidental." "I tell you frankly," said Sidney Hillman, "I am tired of this applause when we get an advance of five dollars." He was speaking to the motion that the Amalgamated form a cooperative bank and join the farmers and trainmen in full support of the cooperative movement. This attitude on the part of the Amalgamated spells a new era in the labor movement which had "getting more" as the sole object of a labor union. In the eyes of this convention getting more and working less hours was only an incident in a larger program.

The entrance of this union into the cooperative movement will have an effect so far reaching that one cannot at present predict where it may lead. It includes the development of cooperative enterprises as a basic part of the Amalgamated program. In this the Amalgamated will be in the vanguard of other unions who will put their money in their own banks, where the money will be used for the workers instead of being possibly used against them. Of equal importance was the resolution passed concerning unemployment, which says:

". . . the worker has a powerful claim upon the industry. He has not invested money in it, because he has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none; he has invested in the industry his life and his energy, which are of still greater social importance. . . .

"Justice dictates that the industry, which depends upon the workers to keep it alive, should take care of them when they are unemployed.

"That can be done only by the creation of a special fund for the payment of unemployment wages; no gift and no alms, but wages from the industry to the worker. . . .

"The Committee, therefore, recommends that the convention go on record in favor of the creation of an unemployment fund. It is our opinion that such a fund should be created by the weekly payment by the employers of a given percentage of the payroll of our members, which shall not be deducted from the payroll but paid into the fund in addition to the payroll. . . ."

This injects a new element into the demands made by the workers upon the employers. It says in substance to the employers, "Order your affairs, gentlemen, in a reasonable fashion so that great numbers of the workers need not be speeded up at one season and at another season thrown out of work. Or if you do not wish to do this, then you should pay the penalty in terms of money instead of making the workers pay the penalty in terms of their lives."

This convention has brought about a union between the Amalgamated Textile Workers of America and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. It is a logical union. The principles of the Amalgamated Textile Workers, their aims, and the form of their union are identical with that of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, yet it is going to lead to a most difficult conflict. The Textile industry is one of the richest industries in America. It has been a powerful and unscrupulous foe of organized labor. It pays higher dividends and less wages than any other industry, and it has fought every move of the Amalgamated Textile Workers.

This organization dates only from May 12, 1919. In this short time it has organized between 45,000 to 50,000 textile workers. It has reduced hours and raised wages for many thousands of workers throughout the country and in the great Lawrence strike it reduced the hours from 54 to 48 and achieved a 50 per cent increase to nearly a quarter of a million textile workers. It is estimated that there are a million textile workers in the United States and of these not 10 per cent are organized. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers, who are approaching 100 per cent organization have opened the door on a large field and a very difficult one.

The resolution granting equal opportunity and equal pay to women's work was perhaps the most important resolution effecting the industry itself. But although it will mean revolutionizing certain branches of the business, it was passed unanimously and with applause. Women have had a harder time in industry in being accepted than they would in former days in getting an equal opportunity in the universities. Of equal importance was the resolution adopting a standard of week's work to supplant piece work throughout the industry. Another important resolution adopted, will put into operation a wide educational campaign. Already in Chicago, New York, Rochester, and other cities there are classes in English, economics, history, but this work is only beginning. In this one may see outlined the new unionism; the vision of a labor union which embraces all of life's activities instead of limiting itself to shop activities, and one which has beside an ultimate program, the democratization of industry.

This organization is now so powerful that where it leads the rest of the needle trades will follow, and if the needle trades together have certain policies (for instance, if needle trades insist on abolishing unemployment) the rest of organized labor will certainly be influenced. What the Amalgamated Textile and Clothing Workers of America undertake, the rest of the unions of the country will hear about, and they will be influenced by what they hear. Schlossberg, in his May Day call to the workers wrote:

"When the history of our present civilization will be written, work such as we are doing will be studied by the historian most. True history is the history of the struggles of the people onward and not the history of rulers keeping the people down. The story of the Amalgamated is the story of the people, practically the entire working population. We are all united in the efforts for improving our conditions today and the final establishment of industrial democracy." This convention will be important in that history.

No Quarrel with the German People

By RONALD B. HOTSON

Essen, Rheinland

THIS letter would never have been written, I am sure, but for the fact that yesterday *I saw a healthy child!* Absolute truth. She was six years old, in the pink of condition, rosy-cheeked, happy, and full of mischief; the little fat rascal! She wasn't a rich man's daughter. I don't see many of them. There aren't many to see. And even they rarely are really *well* nourished. What's the answer? This man has relatives in Holland, and at the outbreak of the war, almost, the baby was sent there. And there she remained until a few weeks ago.

I've seen thousands of children here. Not one of them has had enough milk or other food to be what it should. This Dutch-fed baby is the only one I have seen who has had enough to grow really plump and strong on! The sight of her horrified me to tears, almost. For I realized that I, too, had fallen under the general spell, and had almost come to regard as normal that which is so usual—the awful horror of the starving, suffering, dying children, for whom there is no hope!

There is no hope, for there is no help. No reversal of feeling among the Allies, no sudden access of wisdom and good faith on the part of the supreme little rulers, no matter how profound or benevolent, could transform rickety, deformed children into healthy ones. No miracle of feeding-science can bring back the dead and nearly dead. The old folks, excepting the few rich, are not considered. Nor do they complain much. They wither away and die of some little thing, weakened by starvation, with surprisingly obliging dumbness. But the mothers and children! The sacrifice of the aged avails them nothing. I've heard heart-rending things from doctors about mothers without strength to bear babies, and babies without strength to be born. New and terrible deformities and diseases are common in a land where of all lands they were most rare.

We who have been here but a few months cannot help becoming accustomed to these horrors around us, and take it for granted that the people we know must be aware of these things as we are. I have constantly to remind myself

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that our peoples do *not* know and must be made to know. Only thus can I keep from my heart the despairing bitterness of so many here, who believe that our peoples surely know their misery, and look on calmly, if not with satisfaction.

It is worse than war. The mortality is higher, the cripples made are more numerous. The permanent injury is greater. It is said that suffering brings out the best in us. It does. And, if long enough continued, not only brings it out but murders it. Strong characters become saints, then corpses. Weak ones, ordinary folk, struggle to maintain the standards of decency, of habit and life. But their hunger and their childrens' hunger reduces them to dull hopelessness, or drives them to the cunning and cruel selfishness endemic in the *Schieber, Schleichändler,* or profiteer. It is every man for himself, and starvation take the weak.

The marvel is that there remains so much of goodness and kindliness in this lovable people. The heritage was very strong. Else all would be the ravening wolves the profiteers are. Even in our comparatively short stay we can follow all too painfully the steady fall in morale, health, and mode of life. It is universal. Who can foretell the end? Is there no hope at all? Russia is starving, as is Poland. But Russians have the new light, the new hope. They have something to die for! Germans and Austrians haven't.

Consider the mark: When I first came here in September, 1919, the mark fluctuated between 25 and 30 per cent of its former value, in dollars, and 30 to 40 per cent in francs. It has fallen catastrophically. Today it is worth less than four per cent. In other words, less than one cent at the present depreciated purchasing power of even United States money! This, moreover, is the real value, as far as there is such a thing.

The ration allowances are steadily reduced. The government doesn't get its hands on enough food to make anything like a living ration for the population. It is ridiculously insufficient. I could give evidence *ad infinitum* about that. The upshot is that everybody to maintain life, *must* obtain more food than his ration allows; in other words, must violate the law, and escape detection and punishment, in order to live at all.

It is no justification for inhumanity to argue that if Germany had won she would have done for France what the Allies are doing for her. She probably would have. And that would have been morally as harmful to her people as the present opposite is to all Allied peoples. There may be satisfaction of a hateful sort, but there is no spiritual progress in the knowledge that the enemy is not only down, but his wife and children are being starved. The terms of the peace, far from being healing, condemn these babes to malnutrition and forced labor to produce indemnities, till their fortieth year, if they survive! Is this the result of a glorious crusade?

Organ Grinder

By DAVID ROSENTHAL

When the organ grinder rouses
The afternoon with showers
Of old-rose colored waltzes, down our block,
Faces burgeon from the granite houses,
Like frail flowers
Growing out of rock.

Rain

By WITTER BYNNER

They tell me that we tenderly keep
The happy things,
Forgetting pain.
There was a night when I could not sleep
For happiness of the sound
Of rain
Along the ground.
And in the morning sun, from east to west
I felt the dancing wings
Of a mocking-bird.
And of all the sounds I ever heard
I hear those oftenest,
That rain still falls, that mocking-bird still sings
Though Celia went away
That day,
Not to come back again.

In the Driftway

FROM the headlines one learns: "General Trevino is Sent by Gonzales to Insure President's [Carranza's] Life When Captured." Dear, dear! Is there any risk these insurance men are not willing to underwrite?

* * * * *

OUR State Department will not let Jean Longuet into America because it thinks him too much a Bolshevist, but his own constituency in France is turning against him because it does not think him Bolshevist enough. His father was a Communard in 1870, and was exiled for it; in England he met and married the daughter of Karl Marx, so that Jean Longuet was born in England of a French father and a German mother, and during the war he became the living symbol of French internationalists. Oddly enough his father was a close friend of Clemenceau, and in his boyhood days whenever little Jean came to Paris he stayed with Oncle Georges. Time turned his "uncle" into his bitterest political enemy, and those uninitiated used to wonder why Longuet alone among the Socialist leaders never attacked the old Tiger in the Chamber of Deputies. Longuet was a patriot with the rest of the French Socialists when the war broke out, but he came forward early in favor of the resumption of international relations and of peace without victory, and he defended the Bolshevists as honest experimenters when most of his fellows saw in them only German agents. But he was for Bolshevism in Russia and against it in France, and as the Socialist tide in France turns more and more strongly to the left, Longuet has been astonished to find himself leading the right of his party. He is too much a pacifist to be a thorough revolutionist; his own sympathies are with the evolutionary methods of British labor. He belongs to the pre-war group of Socialist idealists: generous to a fault, quick in sympathy with every oppressed group in the world, but at heart a *bon bourgeois* with no stomach for the unpleasantnesses of revolution.

* * * * *

SOMETIMES it would seem that the war was over, but most times it would not. To be sure children are no longer being named John Pershing Jones or Marshal Foch

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Smith, and it is even on record that the parents of a certain Woodrow Wilson Blank have applied for permission to change the name of their offspring to Reginald Everett Blank, though whether this is a direct result of the war or the peace it is impossible to say. On the other hand, the Espionage Act still flourishes like the green bay tree; the war tax is still making ice cream sodas difficult if not prohibitive; and the Drive—probably one of the worst atrocities of the war, be it Y. W. C. A. or Pity the Poor Professor—continues to render the streets unsafe especially in broad daylight. And now comes a "round-up" of war slackers. It is nothing to our Department of Justice that most of the European countries and Canada have declared a general amnesty for deserters. While resting from their pretty task of search and seizure, our sleuths will now pursue the slacker, a trifle lonesomely, but no doubt with the righteous glow that arises from a duty well and thoroughly performed.

* * * * *

ONE of the objections to daylight saving that the Drifter hears again and again from various persons is that it seeks to impose something unnatural, and even immoral, upon humanity. Such persons talk of "real time," "true time," and "Nature's time" as if such terms meant something, and remark: "You can't cheat the body into thinking it is six o'clock in the morning when it is only five," or ask querulously: "Why should we try to change the time that the Lord has established?" Such comments indicate an odd survival of credulity and innocence on the part of those who voice them. Hardly anything in our conventional world is more conventional, arbitrary, and subject to change than time. The same person who says plaintively that he always seems to "feel sleepier" when he gets up by daylight saving time will take a trip from San Francisco to New York, thus advancing his getting-up time by three hours, and have never a word to say of discomfort. Then there is that small army of persons who cling to the wisdom or righteousness of what they call "sun time," oblivious to the fact that nobody keeps sun time anywhere except such as is read from occasional sun dials.

* * * * *

WHAT do you mean by "real time" and "true time," O ye of great faith? Have you in mind sun time or star time, both equally authentic and respectable in the eyes of Nature? Astronomers and navigators use both; but nobody else uses either. And what every astronomer knows is that this old world has a habit of lagging or hurrying a bit as it rolls round on its axis through eternal space, and does not arrive at the end of its circuit on the crack of noon as indicated by the clocks that man's ingenuity has made to run more regularly. In other words, this sun time of which many persons speak with such reverence is in fact an old-fashioned, unpunctual, irregular-living creature which every $1.98 clock on the market regards with superiority, if not with contempt. So, too, astronomers on land and navigators at sea have to reduce sun (or apparent) time to clock (or mean) time, or vice versa, as a preliminary to their calculations, and no clock time is Nature's time, or can be. And, if we overlook this little irregularity in the habits of the planet which is our world, we still have before us an endless vista of local and standard times, no one of which is more than an approximation to sun time; no one more "true" than another.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The Exchange of Ideas

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Owing to the depreciated currency of Europe and the financial difficulties in which many European nations find themselves, the publication of some European serials has been temporarily discontinued, others have decreased in size, while the publication of still others is irregular. Furthermore, the purchase of American books at the present rate of exchange is practically impossible.

Since it is essential for the intellectual life of mankind, that students of all countries should be in close touch, and since it seems of importance to America that the results of our intellectual activities should be known, the undersigned urge all publishers, publishing institutions and publishing societies to exchange their publications on the most liberal terms with libraries, publishers, journals and publishing institutions and societies of all European countries, disregarding for the near future the question whether the amount of printed matter received in exchange corresponds with the amount sent.

FELIX ADLER
JAMES R. ANGELL
FRANZ BOAS
CHARLES W. ELIOT
J. CARDINAL GIBBONS
ARTHUR T. HADLEY
DAVID STARR JORDAN
HARRY PRATT JUDSON
DR. E. H. LEWINSKI-CORWIN
A. LAWRENCE LOWELL
JOHN BASSETT MOORE
HENRY FAIRFIELD OSBORN
GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY
M. I. PUPIN
JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN
ELLERY SEDGWICK
F. J. V. SKIFF
MUNROE SMITH
DR. ANTONIO STELLA
HARLAN F. STONE
HENRY SUZZALLO
WILLIAM H. TAFT
F. A. VANDERLIP

New York, May 13

An International People's College

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Many have felt the need for young men and women of various nationalities to come together in an international college, linking their countries and educating the peoples toward a better mutual understanding. Steps have already been taken toward the realization of such a project in Denmark.

The school will make its chief appeal to young workers and to students of social problems who are not primarily interested in degrees or certificates. Special attention will be paid to industrial and social problems, and to language. Graduates speaking English and German or French, will be attached to the school, and several Danish university professors have promised to give occasional lectures. Manual work will be provided, so that the pupils may help pay their expenses; and the agricultural school at Lyngby will be available.

It is natural that Denmark should take the lead in this plan because of its central position as a small country, free from imperialist tendencies, and because the idea of *folkehojskoeler* (people's colleges) originated there and is firmly established in the country. These *folkehojskoeler*, permeated with a Christian ethical and democratic spirit, have played an important part in educating the Danish farmers in cooperation.

Warm approbation has been given the scheme in England, Germany, France, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. Among those who have approved it are L. P. Jacks, Sanderson Furness, Sir Oliver Lodge, George Lansbury, Philip Snowden, and George Barnes in England, Eduard Bernstein and Dr. F. Sigmund-Schultze in Germany, Edo Fimmen, secretary of the International Trades Union Federation in Holland, Magnus Nielsen, president of the Norwegian Landting, and Charles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gide and Pastor Monod in France. A provisional committee organized to represent the school in England includes Arthur Henderson, Arnold Rowntree, J. V. Price, of the Workers' Educational Association, Lady Parmoor, Frank Hodges, and Hubert Peet. The Danish Council has as chairman Professor Valdemar Ammundsen, and includes six members of the Rigsdag and representatives of the cooperative educational and religious movements. The representative in America is Peter Manniche, Room 306, 25 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

It is hoped that America, too, will help make the plan a reality. With the present high exchange a fund of $100,000 would make it possible to open the school this autumn. The school would then be in a position to give board, lodging, and tuition for ten months every year to the fifty students which the present building would accommodate, provided that the pupils gave three hours work daily to gardening, poultry-raising, etc.

This international college would be the first of its kind in Europe. The University of Paris in the Middle Ages was international indeed, but it was rather for the sons of the nobility and the clergy than for the working classes. The new college should become one of the channels through which a democratic spirit might be introduced into our modern civilization.

New York, April 24 PETER MANNICHE

Tempora Mutantur et Nos Mutamur in Illis

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Alien Property Custodian in his report comments on the commercial and economic penetration of this country by Germany and of his successful efforts in the destruction of the same. In this connection the following translation of a circular letter by the American Consul General at Berlin, of November 29, 1911, addressed to the merchants of Berlin, may be of interest to your readers:

"This Consulate desires to call attention that it is in a position essentially to help those of your members who at any time desire to establish branch factories in the United States.

"One of the conspicuous principles of the present development of industrial enterprises is, as is well known, the increasing desire of the manufactories, without regard to territorial limits to establish factories in such parts of the globe which offer the most favorable conditions of manufacture and sale. Therefore many of our great American corporations have branch factories in Germany and other parts of Europe, and vice-versa, branch establishments of German and other European manufactories have been established in the United States. *The United States favor* this exchange of industrial activities and welcome therefore all foreign enterprises. And accordingly, the American officials have been instructed to give every help and support to such foreign manufacturers that are desirous of establishing branch offices in the United States. This Consulate is not only in a position to give all preliminary advice, but will also connect the parties interested with the commercial bodies and municipal corporations in the United States for the purpose of facilitating negotiations which in many cases will result in exceptional advantages for the plant enterprises of German manufacture. It is probably known to you that many cities in the United States, especially the flourishing and rapidly developing cities of the Mississippi Valley, offer inducements for their own industrial development to those seeking proper locations for their factories, by offering to them the necessary lands very cheaply, and by granting tax concessions, etc., which will give big advantages to those who accept them. Our municipalities and commercial associations are frequently in a position to make especially favorable arrangements for new enterprises with the railroads and other transportation companies, so that the cost of transportation by securing favorable shipping facilities will be reduced to a minimum."

New York, April 22 PAUL C. SCHNITZLER.

A Transmitted Characteristic

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Two young men, brothers, were crossing the prairies in a caravan with some well-to-do old horse traders. Indians tried to steal the horses. Trouble began. The whites were attacked and withdrew to a bend in the river. They drew up their wagons in a line, and from behind these defended themselves and their stock. When night came the two young men volunteered to ride through the Indians and secure help from the United States garrison thirty miles away. They took the fleetest horses. One horse was shot by the Indians and the rider scalped. The other brother got through and brought help. But in his race to the United States frontier fort he rode his horse to death. When the caravan was in safety, the traders insisted upon being repaid by the surviving brother for the two horses.

Years later the descendants of the young man who rode through the Indians and brought help, went to Europe to fight the Germans. Some of them were killed. When the others returned, the old men who had stayed at home insisted upon being repaid with interest for their war expenses.

New York, April 28 THEODORE M. PEASE

Russia's May Day

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For over two years the world has been disturbed by the novel social and political enterprise in Russia, and it is interesting to note the solicitude of all good people for the populace of that vast country which has been so grievously oppressed.

Anyone who reads the papers has learned that the career of the Bolsheviki has been marked by violence and autocracy from the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly to the present time, when no one is safe if he speaks against the existing government. The nationalization of women which has destroyed all family life; the denial of the vote to any employer; the persecution of all religious people; the use of conscription to raise an army; the despotic rule of the minority (generally calculated as 10 per cent of the people) and the utter failure of the military and economic program of the Bolsheviki have been well established.

And yet thousands of our best Americans appear to fear that the same doctrines may spread to this country and place the people in the same bondage. Surely there can be no desire on the part of any free people to be similarly oppressed! Possibly the most damaging disclosure of all appears on the front page of this morning's *Sun-Herald:*

"Moscow, May 2—Residents of Moscow, estimated to number 150,000, celebrated May day in a novel fashion, devoting part of the holiday to productive work. Long processions of volunteer workers filled the streets early in the morning. . . . The entire population, while imbued with the carnival spirit, seemed impressed with the idea that working on May day was most appropriate in the task of upbuilding the country."

What a deplorable attitude towards the welfare of the community has been developed in the breasts of the citizens of Moscow by two years of the intolerable autocracy of the Bolshevik regime! Think of it—voluntary work to increase production! The next thing we know there will be voluntary payment of taxes, or freedom of speech, or some other reversion in this unrecognized government to the recognized system of the czar.

How can we be saved from a form of government that values the good of the community above individual profit if the conservative press makes a box on the front page of such tenets of Bolshevism?

New York, May 7 THE ARBITRATOR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aliens and the Law

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In *The Nation* for April 17 Paul D. Cravath says: "I think that the deportation of undesirable aliens is an administrative and not a judicial function and should not involve a trial by jury." Since he writes as a lawyer, it must be presumed that he does not leave out of sight that clause of the Constitution which provides that no person "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." (Some copies, which I presume to be inferior, print "nor to be deprived.") It follows, as far as I see, that in Mr. Cravath's judgment either aliens are not "persons" within the meaning of the Constitution, or forcible deportation is not a deprivation of liberty, or "due process of law" in a case involving the liberty of the person does not involve a judicial function, or the Constitutional words "nor be deprived" are limited by "in any criminal case" so that persons not accused of crime are not protected against being deprived of liberty without due process of law. I should be glad to know which of these propositions are considered sound. I fear I am not up to date on the law, and it may be that authoritative courts have determined one or more of these four points to be valid; but may I take the liberty of asking which one or ones? Steven T. Byington

Ballard Vale, Massachusetts, April 30

Justice's Batting Average

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: At last. Certainly now, after having received the letters from eminent New York members of my own profession published in *The Nation* of April 17, you must be convinced that all is well in this country. Even your so-called violations of free speech, press, and assembly need no longer worry you. By "legal minds" you are informed, positively or impliedly, that this is justifiable or excusable because "Trotzky started his career of bloodshed and destruction (concerning which you have read in the New York *Times*) from here," and because "the world has just been inundated with German falsehood." (And if further support is needed you may add French, British, and American falsehood.) "In this democratic country, where the ballot is all-powerful" (forget about Victor Berger, Albany, N. Y., etc.), acts "unlawful in themselves, or in their necessary results, should be stopped at the outset." There you have it. Quoting the Constitution of the United States or Holy Writ may, in the opinion of the corner policeman, be unlawful in its "necessary results" and "stopped at the outset."

Surely all is well. "The right of free speech has been more frequently abused (in whose opinion?) than the power of government to suppress it." Cases of guilty people being hanged are perhaps more frequent than those where they are innocent. On the whole justice is done, because while many should be in jail who are not, others are there who should be out.

Chicago, April 27 Louis R. Holmes

Chinese Students and Officialdom

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Attention should be called to the absurd action of the immigration authorities in instructing the consular body at Shanghai to refuse to visé passports to such Chinese students as wish to go to America on the fellowships of the China Club of Seattle. The far-sighted action of this group of American business men should be encouraged. They are attempting to teach the Chinese what American business life and methods are.

Why cannot there be some cooperation between the interests of America and officialdom? During the war there were distributed, by or through the Legation at Peking, statements by the Shantung business guilds on the actions of the Japanese in that province. These were removed from letters by unintelligent censors. But then the censor deleted "antiphlogistin" from a medical circular.

Peking, China, December 18 George H. Danton

Carrying Coals to Newcastle

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Last August the President of China informed the University of Paris that the Chinese Government would contribute annually 20,000 francs towards the establishment at the Sorbonne of a department of Chinese studies, and last month the French Government contributed a like sum. President Deschanel is patron of the new department, which opens with three courses of lectures—The History of Chinese Civilization, The Applied Sciences in China, and Chinese Painting, Music, and Poetry.

In the meanwhile we are sending missionaries to China!

New York, May 6 Theodore Stanton

It Has Been

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: We have dealt the generals a staggering blow. They threw up embankments of advertisements a hundred feet high, but the people went over the top under the leadership of Senator Hiram Johnson and drove the professional soldiers, Pershing and Wood, from the field.

The people have come into their own. Hundreds of Democrats wrote Johnson's name on their ballots to give him moral support. Will the results of this primary election also be called a pro-German and Bolshevik uprising?

Bartlett, Nebraska, April 24 A. C. Nielsen

Loose Methods in Loose-Leaf

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I trust you will accord me the hospitality of your columns in order to protect my good name as a writer against an unceremonious attempt of the publishers of Nelson's Loose-Leaf Encyclopedia to foist upon me the paternity of a scurrilous attack on "Bolshevism," which appears in the 1920 edition of the Encyclopedia.

In February, 1919, I furnished to Thomas Nelson and Sons an article on Bolshevism, which was published in Volume 2 of the edition of that year of the Loose-Leaf Encyclopedia. A copy of that edition, containing my article, is to be had on the shelves of the reading room of the New York Public Library. In the 1920 edition, out of the three pages of my article ten lines have been reproduced, dealing exclusively with the philological and historical origin of the term "Bolshevism" and giving the real name of Nikolai Lenin. All the rest has been replaced by the production of another writer unknown to me; yet the publishers have taken the liberty to announce me as the author of that screed (See Volume 1).

Brooklyn, April 27 Isaac A. Hourwich

Ireland: The One Solution
By Henry W. Nevinson
An Englishman's View
In the Nation of May 29

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thought

By CHARLES R. MURPHY

Break! and a stir of sod and you have vanished!
And the halter-rope upon the fence is hanging
Motionless, and motionless the meadow
Whose emptiness flood-day may not diminish.
You have outrimmed the verge of our horizon;
Field after field to strangeness shall we follow?
Or is there chance that in a near green hiding
You be at cropping innocent in pasture,
Slyly consenting with your strength and beauty,
Beast-like, guest-like, obliquely at the doorway,
To lend yourself to mastery and stall?

Thinking

By VIRGINIA WOODS MACKALL

Some thoughts are tremulous as birds
  Hovering high in air,
But when I hunt them down with words
  They are not there.

While some go scurrying about
  Like mice that gnaw and tease,
And though I coax them won't come out
  For any cheese!

But others, like a flock of fish,
  Golden and well confined,
Swim round and round and round the dish
  That is my mind.

Books

The Passionate Pilgrim

The Letters of Henry James. Selected and Edited by Percy Lubbock. 2 vols Charles Scribner's Sons.

THE Anglo-Saxon race could never have endured so long the centrifugal energy which has sent its members flying off to all and desperate corners of the earth had there not been at the same time that centripetal contraction which draws so many good Englishmen eventually home to roost in the mother island. Of all these homing creatures Henry James is the great latter laureate, none the less so because of his birth under an alien political system. Indeed, the differing political systems of England and the United States were simply nothing to him, who knew and cared so little for man as a political animal. These amazing letters make clear as never before how thoroughly to such a master of language it was language which outlined the empire of the English and bound its various parts together in spite of such surface matters as oceans and revolutions. Henry James was a loyalist to the tongue of England, who never learned, as students of language perfectly well know, that Westminster can no more make—has no more any right to claim to make—the speech and spelling of Virginia or California than it can make their statutes. And of course speech was for Henry James but a symbol of all the customs which he thought of as centering in or about London and to which he drew near with a passion of return which argues an atavistic hankering in his blood more strong than almost any instinct he ever revealed. How eagerly he accepted all the qualities of England, even to the weather and the manners which he at first found so vile! How ardently he conquered his distastes and converted them into positive affinities! Though there was a time toward the end of his most extended absence from America when he began to long for it—"Europe has ceased to be romantic to me, and my own country, in the evening of my days, has become so"—his longing did not survive the visit which he chronicled in "The American Scene"; and he settled thereafter into that contentment with England which few but Americans ever feel. What modern man has been more absolutely a patriot to his race?

Such patriotism was of course elaborately restrictive. Hardly another novelist of equal eminence could be mentioned who knew so little of history. Henry James's narrow range in speculation appears from the simply boyish letters with which he acknowledged and approved each of his brother William's books—apparently, to judge by these letters, the only philosophy Henry ever read. He seems to have been almost deaf to all harmonies but those of prose, and never read poetry or listened to music except at rare intervals and on forced occasions. To the universe outside the compact Anglo-Saxon park he inhabited he turned strangely short-sighted eyes. "But I don't at all agree with you," he wrote Howells, "in thinking that 'if it is not provincial for an Englishman to be English, a Frenchman French, etc., so it is not provincial for an American to be American.' So it is not provincial for a Russian, an Australian, a Portuguese, a Dane, a Laplander to savor of their respective countries: that would be where the argument would land you. I think it is extremely provincial for a Russian to be very Russian, a Portuguese very Portuguese; for the simple reason that certain national types are essentially and intrinsically provincial." Neither here nor elsewhere in these letters is there any real consciousness that the world has other natural centers of civilization than London. Henry James might be whimsical when he wrote "civis Britannicus sum," but actually his assumption had always been that there was hardly more outside his race to be counted in his philosophy than might have been taken into account by the proudest Spaniard or African or Jew who, under Augustus, had the right to say "civis Romanus sum." Thus it was that Henry James, much as he loved Italy, lived in it so largely as a stranger to its people. Thus it was that, much as he owed to France, he so often had toward the French the attitude of a Tory squire of the eighteenth century. Is it any wonder, then, that he took the trouble to form no opinion regarding the Dreyfus case, and had little more to say of the Boer War than that it doubled his income tax, and that he vaguely hoped our war with Spain might educate Americans as imperialism had educated the English? And of course no wonder, then, that the World War found him uncritical, roused him and *interested* him as nothing outside his art had ever done, and so crowded his vision with the personal and daily heroism which he saw near at hand as quite to shut out all that was stupid or false or sordid in those who allowed the war to come at all. It is a strange irony that he who had been a realist so long should have ended his days in the terrible, red, bitter-sweet mists of romance.

Happily there went with his limitation, as these letters reveal even more fully than the novels, his limitation's virtue, the exquisite and quivering sensitiveness which furnished his art with its materials. He was indeed too conscious of his nationality—too much, in other words, an American—not to lay his principal stress upon the adventures and misadventures of other Americans who, like him but in so many differing spirits, drifted from time to time into the ancestral garden, to stump crudely and noisily about the trim parterre. This consciousness gave him the reputation of being an "international novelist," which he only partially deserves. Rather he was a great artist who,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having been whirled by various accidents into a splendid corner of the world, there assiduously examined all its denizens and citizens and visitors and took note of them. He did not look out for the reason that he could not see out of his corner. His letters to Stevenson repeatedly complain that imagination cannot follow even one's dearest friend as far as to the other side of the globe. "I can't go with you (I mean in the conceptive faculty and the 'realizing sense'), and you are for the time absolutely as if you were dead to me—I mean to my imagination of course—not to my affection or my prayers." Another letter to Stevenson makes clear how intimate was the connection in Henry James between his inability to see far and his passion for vividly seen things in art. "I *did* make one restriction," he writes of Stevenson's narrative of his Pacific travels; "I missed the *visible* in them—I mean as regards people, things, objects, faces, bodies, costumes, features, gestures, manners, the introductory, the *personal* painter-touch. It struck me that you either didn't feel—through some accident—your responsibility on this article quite enough; or, on some theory of your own, had declined it. No theory is kind to us that cheats us of seeing." And again, writing of "David Balfour" ("Catriona"): "The one thing I miss in the book is the note of *visibility*—it subjects my visual sense, my *seeing* imagination, to an almost painful underfeeding. The *hearing* imagination, as it were, is nourished like an alderman, and the loud audibility seems a slight the more on the baffled lust of the eyes—so that I seem to myself (I am speaking of course from the point of view of the way, as I read, *my* impression longs to complete itself) in the presence of voices in the darkness—voices the more distinct and vivid, the more brave and sonorous, as voices always are—but also the more tormenting and confounding—by reason of these bandaged eyes. I utter a pleading moan when you, e. g., transport your characters, toward the end, in a line or two from Leyden to Dunkirk without the glint of a hint of all the ambient pictures of the eighteenth-century road." These comments flood with light Henry James's lack of interest, for his own art, in exotic materials, his relative unconcern with history, his positive sense of nakedness in the great, empty reaches of his native land. To do his best work he needed a narrower field and a straiter tower, with a minimum of distraction.

All the more, however, finding him thus restricted as to race and sympathies and images, do we find ourselves admiring the magnificent passion with which he worked at his art. His famous Prefaces to his novels and tales are accepted as an indispensable handbook to the art of fiction. No less may his letters be considered indispensable to those serious students and fellow-artists who wish to observe a genius massively revolving and tirelessly experimenting. This does not mean that, like Cellini, Henry James reveals many personal secrets, or even as many professional secrets as in his Prefaces; but that he so clearly lets us see him fitting his great strength to his tasks. Mere ambition and the desire for money had less to do with his long struggle to write plays than an instinct to make some larger use of the powers which he could not help feeling were partly wasted on the little audience which bought his books. And something of the same instinct it seems to have been which led him in 1888 to decide that he would give up novels for a "longish period": "I want to leave a multitude of pictures of my time, projecting my small circular frame upon as many different spots as possible and going in for number as well as quality, so that the number may constitute a total having a certain value as observation and testimony." More indisputable evidence of his strength is the fact that his short stories were always outgrowing the dimensions he planned for them, and his novels were likely to start off with so generous a stride that if he was to keep them within decent lengths at all he must drag his narrative down to its conclusion more rapidly than it had risen. Also, alas, it must have been his sense of strength—only of strength foiled and not quite successful—that made him petulant toward the success of Thomas Hardy and too frequently plaintive about his own lack of money.

Where the temptation to quote is irresistible it should not be resisted. The problem is how to choose among so much that cries for quoting. But here is a comment upon H. G. Wells in a letter to Mr. Wells: "I have read you then, I need scarcely tell you, with an intensified sense of that life and force and temperament, that fulness of endowment and easy impudence of genius, which makes you extraordinary and which have long claimed my unstinted admiration: you being for me so much the most interesting and masterful prose-painter of your English generation (or, indeed, of your generation unqualified) that I see you hang there over the subject scene practically all alone; a far-flaring even though turbid and smoky lamp, projecting the most vivid and splendid golden splotches, *creating* them about the field—shining, scattered, innumerable morsels of a huge smashed mirror. . . . Your big feeling for life, your capacity for chewing up the thickness of the world in such enormous mouthfuls, while you fairly slobber, so to speak, with the multitudinous taste—this constitutes for me a rare and admirable exhibition, on your part, in itself, so that one should doubtless frankly ask one's self what the devil, in the way of effect and evocation and general demonic activity, one wants more." This about the average person: "I am rather easily sated, in the direct way, with the mainly 'broad' and monotonously massive characters of that type [the type of Weir of Hermiston], uncouth of sound, and with their tendency to be almost stupidly sane. History never does them—never *has*, I think—*in*adequate justice . . .; and it's all right and there they numerously and soundly and heavily were and are. But they but renew, ever (when reproduced), my personal appetite—by reaction—for the handlers of the fiddle-string and the fumblers for the essence." Now and then Henry James touched the graver rules of life, as in a letter to Edith Wharton: "I am deeply distressed at the situation you describe and as to which my power to suggest or enlighten now quite miserably fails me. I move in darkness; I rack my brain; I gnash my teeth; I don't pretend to understand or to imagine. . . . Only sit tight yourself *and go through the movements of life*. That keeps up our connection with life—I mean of the immediate and apparent life; behind which, all the while, the deeper and darker and unapparent, in which things *really* happen to us, learns, under that hygiene, to stay in its place. Let it get out of its place and it swamps the scene; besides which its place, God knows, is enough for it! Live it all through, every inch of it—out of it something valuable will come—but live it ever so quietly; and—*je maintiens mon dire*—waitingly!"

C. V. D.

The Agony of a Victorian

Some Diversions of a Man of Letters. By Edmund Gosse. Charles Scribner's Sons.

MR. GOSSE is troubled. When Sully-Prudhomme was elected to the French Academy in 1881, he was acclaimed as the best lyric poet of the age; in 1908 Remy de Gourmont called his verse balderdash. Then, recently, came Mr. Lytton Strachey with his glittering scalpel and his icy smile. Mr. Gosse is bravely determined not to be a mere praiser of time past. His poise is beautiful; he is immensely urbane to the younger critic and grants the latter's contentions right and left. But he cannot hide the sadness in his heart at the thought of the cold young men with something inscrutable in their faces who despise so much that is venerable and beautiful to him. "The whole study of the fine arts would lead to despair," he exclaims, if we were to admit "that no conceivable principle of taste exists!" He wants a standard and a criterion wherewith to confound so much destructive violence and save the gods of his own youth.

He is really always on the verge of understanding the case of those young men, but he lets that understanding slip from his mind. Some inner censor, some piety toward his own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"days of emotional freshness," will not let him grasp and hold it. He admits that of all the great Victorians the younger poets have been influenced by Matthew Arnold alone; he knows, despite an inhibited silence on this point, that no reaction has shaken the solidity of John Stuart Mill's fame; he adds his blows to the destruction of the Tennyson legend, and to the exposure of the pompous prigs who lied to save the public a knowledge of their idol's appetite for praise and port; he is aware that Sully-Prudhomme was capable of proving in one didactic epic that justice inhabits man's consciousness alone, which is an empty platitude, and in another that indiscriminate self-sacrifice is the only source of happiness, which is a shallow and a dangerous one. Yet Mr. Gosse refuses to draw the plain inference from the facts before him. The reaction that counts has set in against those Victorians whom "it hurt to think," who followed and never led the general thought of a confused and timid period, of whom the great and simple words of Matthew Arnold,

> When the forts of folly fall,
> Find thy body by the wall,

could never have been spoken.

Yet from Remy de Gourmont, the very critic whom he quotes, Mr. Gosse might have learned the answer to his troubled question. "En littérature, le fond des choses a une importance absolue; aucune des variétés de la littérature ne peut se soustraire à la nécessité de creuser des fondations et de les maçonner solidement." And this foundation of literature which must be deeply sunk and solidly builded is the creative artist's breadth and intensity of experience and his own veracity toward it. But that is precisely the thing which Mr. Gosse himself is far too Victorian to know, and on which he finally gives himself away with a pathetic helplessness. He celebrates the soldier poets of England in the set terms of a traditional eloquence. He speaks in the strains of Southey on Nelson concerning all those whose sentiments were tribal and correct. He comes to Siegfried Sassoon, and patronizes him uneasily. "He may not always have thought correctly, nor have recorded his impressions with proper circumspection, but his honesty must be respectfully acknowledged." Instinctively, Mr. Gosse assumes here that mass thinking is correct thinking and that the unique experiences of the creative vision are to be uttered with "proper circumspection." Those deadly words sum up everything in the Victorian age that the world, to save itself, must willingly let die. Does Mr. Gosse suppose that Euripides or Shakespeare or Goethe wrote with "proper circumspection," one eye carefully cocked at the contemporary pillars of society? He knows that their loyalty belonged to their personal experience and to their personal vision alone. But a Victorian cannot apply the wild ways of the great solitaries to his own time.

Since, then, Mr. Gosse will not let himself assign the anti-Victorian reaction to its true causes, he shifts the issue to the old question of the "fluctuations of taste," asks "for the fixed and permanent element in beauty," and wonders over the passing of the "laws of style." Here, too, his troubled soul could easily find peace. The varieties of aesthetic beauty are, happily, as infinite as the faces and the forms of men. Reactions against a definite variety are brief and impermanent. As consciousness itself cannot persist without the stimulus of change, so the aesthetic sensibilities need to be refreshed and stirred anew. We are still cloyed by the rich and rounded forms of the Victorians, but the beauty of those forms stands in no danger of permanent decay. The contemporaries of Hayley shuddered at the closed couplet. Today we hear once more the brilliant energy and suave incisiveness of Pope's best passages. New thoughts and perceptions create their own forms, and the artist, as Goethe said, works from within outward. And whatever in these thoughts and perceptions is humanly valid, whatever enriches or interprets the experience of the race, will build itself a form whose beauty transcends the fluctuations of some temporary liking. The music of Catullus and Shelley, of Heine and Leconte de Lisle is equally native to a well-attuned ear. No beauty perishes save one built on foundations of stubble. Time will not darken the sunset glow and surge of Ulysses or The Lotos-Eaters; it has already dealt with the pretentious inanities of The Princess. The music of Shelley sounds clearer to us than Wordsworth's because it never arose from an impossible religion or a shabby set of moral prejudices. But wherever the beauty of Wordsworth is disengaged from that religion and those prejudices it is no less secure than Shelley's.

But this statement of the possibilities of beauty, infinite as the varieties of experience that gave it birth, would not satisfy Mr. Gosse. He would still want a constant element in the abstract form itself, a fixed point amid the variables. Like all his generation he is not happy in a world of change nor on a road which is also the goal. Now there is no doubt that some such constant element exists. Poetry being, like music, an art in time, its beauty is somehow dependent on the element of rhythm which, in its turn, conforms to something in the biological character of man himself. The psychologist and physiologist have something to say about that and will have more to say in time. But it is hard to see what comfort the isolation and definition of this constant element in the beauty of poetic forms would give the humanistic critic or the lover of art. It could never be used as a criterion or as a law of poetics. Like the immanent laws of nature it would merely tell us something concerning the inner nature of poetry whenever or in whatever form it may appear. To the critic, however, the wonder and the delight are in the very multiformity of experience and expression, in the heightening of our very consciousness of life by the eternal adventure of art.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

The Way of a War

Before the War. By Viscount Haldane. Funk and Wagnalls.

THE first part of Viscount Haldane's book is an account of the part which he took in Anglo-German diplomatic relations from 1905 to 1914, being chiefly devoted to the "conversations" which he had with the Kaiser, Bethmann-Hollweg, and others in Berlin and London. The rest of the volume is devoted largely to a discussion of Bethmann-Hollweg's "Betrachtungen zum Weltkriege" and Von Tirpitz's "Erinnerungen." The purpose of the book, or at least the effect of it, is to justify the conduct of Great Britain, not necessarily in every detail, but in respect to the main lines of its policy, and above all in respect to the motives which determined that policy. On the other hand, while admitting that the Kaiser and Bethmann-Hollweg really desired to preserve the peace, the German government is made responsible in that it was influenced by a false political philosophy, misconceived the purposes of the French and British governments, and as a consequence pursued a line of conduct which precipitated the war instead of preserving the peace which every one desired. It goes without saying that Viscount Haldane makes out a good case for Great Britain; but he does so in anything but a blindly chauvinistic temper. Without anger or irritation, imputing sinister motives to none, he deals honestly with the facts as he sees them and presents his case with a patient and persuasive reasonableness that lends an air of finality to his conclusions.

Nevertheless, what strikes one on reflection is that the discussion never goes below the surface of things. It assumes the game and the rules of the game; and on this basis endeavors to assess the relative expertness with which the different players managed their cards. Whether there might not be something radically wrong with the game itself, still more with the objects for which it is played, seems never to have been inquired into. Take, for example, the various diplomatic "conversations." It appears that what every one had most at heart was to preserve

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good relations between the two countries to the end that peace might be preserved. If it were so in fact, why in Heaven's name, one asks, could not these able and honorable men accomplish their purpose? Into this fundamental question the author does not seriously inquire. He rather assumes that diplomacy was a proper means to this end, if only it had been as intelligently employed on the German side as on the British. But the rereading of these "conversations" (they have been for the most part already printed in various journals) leaves us more than ever with a high sense of their futility. These are not the conversations of men who aim primarily to probe to the heart of a situation, who wish at all costs to face frankly the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. They are the conversations of men whose primary aim is to maintain the "interests" of their respective countries unimpaired. Each man accordingly feels that he must be above all careful to make such statements only as will serve to place his country in the best light. One feels therefore that each side wishes, not so much to touch upon the real difficulties as to avoid them, not so much to answer grievances as to explain them away, not so much to present the situation as it is precisely as to present it in such a way that no effective points can be scored by the other side. Admitted to these intimate preliminary conversations of 1912 between Haldane and Bethmann-Hollweg which were conducted with so much leisurely urbanity, summoned to take luncheon at the Schloss with the Emperor and Empress where cordiality and good breeding were the order of the hour, one is overcome with the atmosphere of friendliness and good will: Never, surely, one feels, were people more reasonable or more disposed to make concessions; the differences between the two countries are after all negligible; their objects being identical, an agreement is merely a matter of writing out a few paragraphs in English and German. Next day these paragraphs are written out and presented by Bethmann, and are found totally inadmissible by Haldane. Diplomatic conversations are significant chiefly for what they omit.

It is likewise by virtue of remaining on the surface of things that Viscount Haldane, in the discussion of the books of Bethmann and Von Tirpitz, makes out his case for Great Britain. He makes out a better case for Great Britain than either Bethmann or Tirpitz makes out for Germany; but the defense is of the same order; different conclusions being reached because of a difference in point of view and because, so to speak, of the international exchange of motives which is effected. Haldane defends the British and French governments against the charge of having adopted a policy of *Einkreisung*. "The notion of an encirclement of Germany," he says, "excepting in defense against aggression by Germany herself, existed only in the minds of nervous Germans themselves." Very true. But the Germans would reply, and do in substance reply: "The notion of aggression by Germany, excepting in assertion of her rights against the Entente policy of encirclement, existed only in the minds of the nervous Entente peoples themselves." As one German apologist has put it, in a delicious German phrase, Germany answered the policy of *Einkreisung* by adopting necessarily the policy of *Selbstauskreisung*. There you have it. France and Great Britain, fearing German aggression, form an Entente. Germany, fearing this Entente, becomes more aggressive. France and Great Britain, alarmed at this new aggressiveness, tighten the Entente by bringing in Russia; whereupon Germany talks still more loudly, and the Entente is still further consolidated. There is no end to this process, which, designed to preserve "peace with honor," ends inevitably in war. Now Viscount Haldane's only solution of this situation is to argue that Germany misjudged the motives of the Allies, that if she had rightly understood the fact that the Entente was not designed to harm Germany, all would have been well. The solution of Bethmann is the same: if the Entente had understood rightly the fact that Germany had no wish to harm the Entente, all would have been well.

The burden of this book, like that of the whole literature of war apologetics, is substantially this: "We were not responsible; our motives were of the highest; we did our best to prevent the war; how different it would have been if all had pursued the same high aims and followed a similarly defensible line of conduct!" All this may be admitted. But the truth is that the governments on both sides felt, rightly or wrongly, that the political and economic exploitation of Asia and Africa was an essential "interest" to be pursued by their own people. Each side accordingly, observing more or less strictly the customary amenities, said to the other: "These advantages our welfare and our honor require us to possess; we have no intention of harming you if you do not interfere with our methods of obtaining them." It is futile to argue *Einkreisung* versus *Selbstauskreisung*. Since the "notion" of German aggression existed in the minds of the Entente peoples, and the "notion" of encirclement existed in the minds of Germans, the effect was much the same to all political and historical intents and purposes as if the notion corresponded to a fact. What has to be inquired into is the value of those "interests" which governments pursue, with the purest motives it may be; and in case, and in so far as, they prove to be genuine and indispensable interests, what has further to be inquired into is whether they may not be realized cooperatively, on the basis of relative needs, instead of competitively, on the basis of force and cunning.

Whatever may be the superficiality of Viscount Haldane's discussion of the causes of the war, one cannot but welcome, in these days when sound and fury usurp the place of reason and tolerance, the humane and generous spirit in which he approaches the problem. "I have seen something of the Germans," he says, "and what I have learned of them and of their history has led me to the conclusion that, certain traditions of theirs notwithstanding, they resemble us more than they differ from us. If this be so, the sooner we take advantage of our present victory by seeking to turn our eyes from the past as far as can be, and look steadily toward a future in which the misery and sin which that past saw shall be dwelt on to the least extent that is practicable, the better it will be for ourselves as well as for the rest of the world." By all means let us not dwell on the misery and sin of the past, at all events not for the emotional satisfaction of saying "we at least were without sin." To suppose that the responsibility for this war can be "localized," that its sin can be atoned for vicariously in the person of some Kaiser or Cabal, will be to live in a fool's paradise indeed. Let us at least dwell on the past for the purpose of searching out, and correcting if we can, the general conditions, for which we are all in our different measures responsible, which made the misery and sin possible.

CARL BECKER

Moods of the Drama

Masks. One-Act Plays of Contemporary Life. By George Middleton. Henry Holt and Company.
Ten Plays. By David Pinski. B. W. Huebsch.
Three Plays. By Noel Leslie. The Four Seas Company.
Three Plays of the Argentine. Translated by J. S. Fassett, Jr., edited by E. H. Bierstadt. Duffield and Company.

THE symbolist play is one of the most difficult forms in literature. To be effective it needs to crystallize a powerful idea. This idea, however rich and intricate the play's literary texture, must be thoroughly clear before the end, yet it must never assume the nakedness of argument. Symbolism in the drama demands, in a word, a powerful mind and a rich imagination at the same time. No wonder that its real successes are few and can be picked out easily from the rather portentous mass of symbolist plays produced in all countries since Maeterlinck, who himself substituted atmosphere for ideas, started the movement in the nineties.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. George Middleton is the latest to follow the symbolist fashion. But his following is tentative and he never detaches his material too rashly from the recognizable forms of life. He gives himself no mystic airs and thus avoids the graver danger on his path. Into the other danger of the symbolist drama that does not quite out-soar reality, namely, the sentimental, he falls in his last play, "The House." His strength is in his ideas. He has thought justly and forcibly; he is clear where others are muddled, and collected where others are confused. And this clearness of his applies both to art, as in "Masks," and to the practical life, as in "Tides." The coincident dramatic structure and reasoning in "Masks" provides the first adequate description in our literature of the artist who denies his art for money and yet is not wholly guilty. His situation is admirably illustrated by the fact that when his false play succeeds even his wife reveals a oneness with the mob from which only her love of him and never her convictions had divided her. Equally admirable is the character of William White in "Tides," an "enemy of the people" with every quality of Ibsen's protagonist except the power to stand alone. "Jim's Beast" and "Among the Lions" are less convincing. "The Reason," an excellent play, is frankly realistic. What prevents Mr. Middleton's work a little from fulfilling one's highest expectations of it is his dialogue. About this there is something at once drained and angular. It has the timbre of neither poetry nor reality. In passion it is cold and in vision meager. This weakness, one should add, is not wholly personal to Mr. Middleton. We have little folk-speech. The conversation of our educated classes vacillates between the bookish and the humorously slangy. A sound method or tradition of dramatic dialogue is not yet ours.

Mr. Pinski, whose literary past is, of course, European, has become an unswerving symbolist. He has deliberately silenced the voice of nature that sounded so clearly in his earlier plays. He still cultivates the ironic anecdote in dramatic form—"The Phonograph," "The Dollar"—but his mind is more fixed on the bare intention than on the stuff of life. His peculiar dangers are the fantastic and the obscure, and these make several of his plays ineffectual. Their leading ideas have not been clear and energetic enough in his own mind. When Mr. Pinski has an idea of such quality, as in "Cripples" or "Diplomacy," his execution is brilliant. The dimness of "The Inventor and the King's Daughter" and of "The Stranger" is probably attributable to a murkiness in the creative process itself. There exists no subtlety so fine-spun that the methods of art cannot interpret it. In "The Stranger," for instance, the quality of the symbolic Jew's sin is never clear. Having read "Diplomacy" one is unwilling to believe that Mr. Pinski thinks the tragedy of the race due to a lack of military energy. Yet such is the plain sense of Guryon's last words. "Poland—1919," on the other hand, is magnificent. It has searching analysis, tragic richness, a final vision that the mind follows and accepts at once. But we wish that Mr. Pinski could be persuaded to embody his ideas with something of that abundant reality of which he was master in his earlier years.

Not all the younger dramatists are entirely given over to symbolism. Of Mr. Noel's three one-act plays the second, "The War-Fly," is quite dark in drift and meaning and so one suspects that neither matters greatly. His first and third plays, on the contrary, "Waste" and "For King and Country," are drenched with significance because they strain after no symbolism and are philosophical because they are true. It is so much more useful and agreeable for an artist to make us reflect than to hand out to us reflections ready made. There we have, baldly put, a fundamental contrast between realism or naturalism and symbolism. Give us life in art and we shall catch the subtlest implications—both yours and those beyond you. Aim at us but a single implication, and your arrow has a good chance of going wild. The abandoned girl in "Waste," the blinded soldier in "For King and Country" are their own very sufficient moralists. We hear their voices and the voices of those about them, and the profoundly human accents thus heard teach us more about life than all the stripped and artificially reembodied ideas of the symbolists.

The plays of the Argentine take us into another world. Their folk origin amid the *gauchos* and circuses of the pampas make them extraordinarily interesting to the student of letters. When we come to the actual texture of these *dramas criollos* the impression is one of slight disappointment. The figure of the wandering *gaucho* and minstrel is romantic rather than naive. Speech and verse, at least in their translated forms, present a curious mixture of the sentimental and the artificial. In "The Witch's Mountain" there is high and concentrated dramatic passion. But this play is obviously the least primitive of the three. "Juan Moreira" is like the text of a late and sophisticated puppet-play. "Santos Vega," which deals with the last of the great half-legendary *gauchos* and minstrels, has an undertone of pathos. But the swelling language seems to bring out only the more clearly an inner tameness. The wind of those great plains and the revolt of a wild type of man against a slowly encroaching and unbeautiful order are not clearly heard by ears accustomed to severer moods and words in the literature of the folk. Once the onset of battling Indians is likened to "a sudden cloud on a stormy night driven by a hundred winds." But such energy of speech is rare. The *gauchos* talk ordinarily as though they had read the second-rate books of the romantic period.

Art

A Comparative Study in Rebellion

PHILADELPHIA has discovered Matisse, Picasso, and their school, and is immensely proud of the discovery, though the exhibition of "Representative Modern Masters" at the Pennsylvania Academy is more of an event in Philadelphia than it would be in New York. "Modern" here means not today only but a yesterday that goes back as far as Courbet.

That Courbet, in his time, was the arch-rebel is hard to believe by a generation educated up, or down, to Matisse. Even his Bon Jour M. Courbet would seem academic judged by present standards of rebellion. As it is, The Great Oak of Ornans and the portraits by which he is represented smell overwhelmingly of the Louvre in their present company. For the truth is that Courbet rebelled against not the tradition of art, but the formula of the schools. He respected tradition, he carried on tradition, as far as the qualities hitherto believed essential to art are concerned. Form, color, composition, beauty of surface, all meant as much to him as they had to the masters of the past. He was occupied with these same problems, if he sought their solution by other methods. Not that he sacrificed his individuality. Indeed, it was this individuality that shocked and puzzled his contemporaries. He had just what the little men so bent on expressing themselves today have not got—an individuality, and an uncommonly powerful one, to express. But, humble student of tradition as he was, he could not stand the hide-bound convention, the lifeless formula, that the schools since David's time had been making of it in France. He was up in arms against the pompous *pompiers* who threatened to stifle art in their devotion to *recipe*, and the result is that when Courbet is seen in their midst his rebellion leaps to the eye, while, among the masters, he takes and holds his place.

The next generation deplored a fresh rebellion in a fresh movement, the leaders of which are now given much space at the Academy. Here is Manet: portraits of Spanish women, characteristic, if not his finest; one of those troubled seas with boats and sails that make us wish his paintings of the sea had been more numerous; drawings, suggestive notes; one of his etchings for Mallarmé's translation of Poe's Raven. Here is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Monet in work of many periods, from early landscapes as full of detail as the Garden at Vertheuil to one of the Studies of the Thames, done with the breadth of his later manner, London and its river all but lost in technical experiment. Here is Renoir, though altogether disappointing, especially when it is remembered that a Philadelphian is said to own the largest collection of his pictures in existence. It surely should have been easy to spare a room for him as well as for Miss Mary Cassatt, in much of whose work his influence is evident. Here, too, in flower-like impressions of ballet girls, is Degas, who influenced her still more. And here are Seurat and Signac, Cézanne and Gauguin. The regret is that Whistler figures with them, for, of his three paintings, the small nude is at least doubtful; the Chelsea Girl cannot compare to the fine Mrs. Cassatt in the same collection, but for some reason not lent with it; while the White Woman, as it is catalogued, is one of the defaced canvases from Whistler's bankruptcy sale, bought by Thomas Way, cleaned and worked over by T. R. Way, necessarily suffering in the process. The choice of the examples of the various artists rested, it is true, on the amiability of their owners. But the student, in bewilderment, cannot but question the lack of proportion in the results of this choice. He cannot quite understand, for instance, the prominence reserved for Miss Cassatt. He will not question it, however. The room she fills will be a delight to him and he will find in it much to study. Many of her portraits of women and children that often seem truer to life than life itself are here included, also the masterly etchings in which she uses color with the reticence and decorative quality of the Japanese in their wood-blocks, unmistakably her models. Women in numbers have dabbled in art, a few have grasped its technique, but Miss Cassatt is the exceptional woman who can rank with men as an artist and whose sex is forgotten in her work. The same distinction is sometimes claimed for Berthe Morisot, also identified with the Impressionists. But even in her one painting shown—Boats—it can be seen that in her case identification meant a more complete reflection of her masters.

The scandal made by the Impressionists in their time is not forgotten. The Salon des Refusés in 1863 is now an old story, and no reminder is needed that, sane as they appear to us, the Impressionists were looked upon by their contemporaries as more hopeless outlaws than Courbet and their performances as a greater insult to art than his. And yet, like Courbet, they were never rebels against the tradition of art; like him they were fighting formula, convention. Their respect was for tradition, their aim was to carry it on, but after their fashion. Again, like Courbet, they were determined to express their individuality at whatever cost, as long as the essentials of art were not sacrificed. Form, color, composition, technique were never cast off by them as *vieux jeu*, differ as they might, and did, from all artists who had gone before them in their way of seeing things and expressing themselves. Even Cézanne, whom the new rebels accept, seems as academic here in his large flower and fruit pieces as Courbet in his spreading oak. Even Gauguin, though in one breath he might cry out against the old European traditions and the timidities of the degenerate, in the next was longing to express things as he saw them, to put upon his canvas the violent pure colors, the golden figures, the glorious sun of the South Seas, as he often failed lamentably to do but did so triumphantly in his large Ia Orana Maria.

It is another matter when it comes to the later rebels. Between them and the men who have gone before there is not merely a difference but a wide gulf, for a link in the long chain of tradition has snapped. In their rebellion it is tradition, and not formula, they have turned against. They would wipe out in a day all that the centuries have carefully cherished as symbols of beauty and charm, dignity and distinction. They have already gone further than Gauguin, who, if he was always seeking, seeking, as he said, sought as Titian sought, as Rem-

ALFRED · A · KNOPF BORZOI BOOKS 220 W. 42 Street, NEW YORK

Mexico—and the Danger Signal

"With a considerable part of the public press clamorous for drastic action against Mexico, the army champing in the bit in its eagerness 'to go in and clean them up,' and some quite heavy stock in Washington that never raised a trot before galloping furiously down the line, shouting 'Intervention!'—the publication of Mr. de Bekker's book (THE PLOT AGAINST MEXICO) giving the other side of the question, is timely."

That, gentlemen, is a quotation from *The New York Times!* "Timely" is a mild word. THE PLOT AGAINST MEXICO is a history-making warning signal against the enterprise of certain American interests that would take advantage of Mexico's weakness and turmoil now. ($2.00; *illus.*)

A Superfluity of Adjectives

is the malignant rock on which the writer of Book advertisements most times runs afoul, and in the effort to describe a really good work without hyperbole a dry sterility is often attained. So in the case of WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD, a delightful novel by E. M. Forster. So many nice things have been said by the reviewers that to repeat them would be to offer a menu consisting entirely of cream puffs. We suggest simply that most *Nation* readers will find the story altogether charming, as did Hugh Walpole and John Galsworthy. ($2.00 *net.*)

Richard Kurt

A Novel, by Stephen Hudson. The story of Richard Kurt and two very remarkable and vastly different women, Elinor and Virginia. "A tragic revelation of the sterile decadence of a section of European society, a section in which minor royalties, plutocrats and the *haute bourgeoisie* mingle to their mutual destruction."—*The Arts Gazette*, London. This book will be published May 22. ($2.25 *net.*)

A Canticle of Pan

Wytter Bynner's new book of poems (to be published May 22) is his most important collection to date. The title poem is a chant of communion between the Christ-Child and the pagan god Pan, cast in a new verse-form. *The Canticle of Bacchus* was performed at Berkeley under the star-tipped nave of a grove of redwoods. The rest is a collection of Mr. Bynner's best recent lyrics (nearly 150), some of which have appeared in *The Nation*. ($2.00 *net*).

This Simian World

Suppose another species of animals had had all of Man's advantages, and had, instead of him, become the dominant race. Would the world that the elephants or the ants, let us say, would have built have been greatly different from ours? Mr. Day thinks the comparison a useful one so far as man is concerned and it points conclusively to the origin in our brute ancestors, of many otherwise puzzling traits of the Human. An entertaining volume, amusingly illustrated in pen-and-ink by the author. ($1.50 *net.*)

"One of the Very Brilliant Things in Recent Literature"

is *The Nation* reviewer's characterization of the remarkable picture of Chicago Society which Mary Borden paints in her novel THE ROMANTIC WOMAN. The scandalous appeal of the book is only incidental; primarily it is a great literary attainment. "We Americans swathe things . . . ," says *The Nation;* "Mary Borden sees all that magnificently and records her perceptions with a candor at once cool and burning. Her style has a quality like the bluish shimmer on steel. She conveys the richness, the distinction, and the vigor of an arresting character and mind." ($2.00 *net.*)

Marjorie

the epitome of the old-new woman—"smoking a cigarette while running the carpet-cleaner"—continues to be the storm-center of the discussion created by THE BOOK OF MARJORIE. "Jim," the author, who was only Marjorie's husband is therefore only incidental to the matter, although a good many newspaper people have been trying to work out his identity and thereby achieve sensationalism. But we think Peter-Mary Jane has been unduly neglected. Everyone who has raised a child—either in theory or in practice—will want to have a finger in Peter-Mary Jane's upbringing, for there are many of Marjorie's and Jim's theories with which they will disagree. ($1.50)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brandt sought, as Velasquez sought—with Nature before him—though haltingly where they were supreme. But Matisse and Picasso and their imitators seek with their backs to Nature, seek, with the effort visible on their canvas, to defy, to ignore Nature, or what Nature has heretofore signified to the artist. Form, as artists conceived it in the past, is distorted, color is controlled by new laws, composition is concerned with the primitive scaffolding rather than the finished structure. It is in this they differ, in their breaking loose from all that art has stood for. They may think that only by breaking loose will they find means of their own to express themselves, their abstract feelings. But it is curious, if their individuality requires so violent a departure to express itself, that the same methods should serve to express the individuality of all the group. There is more sameness in a show of Post-Impressionists than in that of any of the schools from which they have seceded; while, though it would not be easy to mistake a Manet for a Monet, a Whistler for a Degas, a Cézanne for a Gauguin, the catalogue must be consulted—at a contemporary Post-Impressionist show—to make sure who each exhibitor is. It may be that the results of their rebellion have a value, but, whatever this value may be, it is not that of art as art has hitherto been considered. Matisse and Picasso have had the training of artists. The black-and-white studies of the nude by Matisse and his huge flower piece, which would not look out of place in the Salon, show the solid foundation upon which his labored primitiveness has been built up. There are life studies and portraits by Picasso—though none in this exhibition—which would not discredit the most serious student from the Beaux-Arts. The methods of expression they eventually invented, however, afford to their followers a short cut, a freedom from technical training impossible to the artist whose faith is still firm in the tradition of art. The interest of the collection, therefore, is in the way it emphasizes the line that divides the new rebels from the old.

N. N.

MUSICAL PORTRAITS

By

Paul Rosenfeld

Modern composers interpreted with insight and power

Wagner	*Strauss*	*Moussorgsky*	*Liszt*
Berlioz	*Franck*	*Debussy*	*Ravel*
Borodin	*Rimsky-Korsakoff*	*Rachmaninoff*	*Scriabine*
Strawinsky	*Mahler*	*Reger*	*Schoenberg*
Sibelius	*Loeffler*	*Ornstein*	*Bloch*

$2.50

NEW ITALY

By Helen Zimmern and Antonio Agresti

Italy to-day, its people and its problems. *$2.00*

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE GREAT WAR

By A. F. Pollard

With special maps. *$3.25*

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL ETHICS

By John M. Mecklin

A study of the American social conscience. *$3.75*

EASY LESSONS IN EINSTEIN

By Edwin E. Slosson

A short and authoritative explanation of this famous theory. *$1.35*

HARCOURT, BRACE & HOWE, 1 WEST 47th ST. NEW YORK

ANNOUNCEMENT OF A NEW IDEA

A group of far-sighted people have organized a corporation with the object of producing motion pictures to further the cause of labor and general human betterment.

Another aim is to counterbalance the vast and indiscriminate output of obviously biased films, strongly antagonistic to a fair-minded presentation of important problems of the day.

Our project also includes the presentation of the highest creations in drama and literature in an unmutilated manner.

Our enterprise has already been endorsed by nationally-prominent Laborites, Liberals and Radicals.

This announcement is addressed to all liberal-minded men and women who desire to see this idea achieved.

Your interest and cooperation are invited.

A descriptive folder giving our plans in detail will be mailed upon request.

Address:

Labor Film Service, Inc.

31 Union Sq., New York

LECTURES BY FRANK HARRIS

Critic, Author and Orator. Famous Editor of "Pearson's Magazine." Great Shakespearean Scholar. Acclaimed Biographer of "Oscar Wilde." Friend and Intimate of Greatest Literary and Artistic Contemporaries. Vivid Platform Speaker and Lecturer.

Lectures on a Variety of Interesting Subjects Presented in His Unique Manner can be arranged For Clubs, Societies and Literary Organizations at a Reasonable Fee

Immediate and Future Dates Now Available
Write for Details and Circular to

Symon Gould, Lecture Manager,

107 East Fourth Street **New York City**

LECTURE BY FRANK HARRIS

The Inveterate Foe of England on "THE IRISH AS A NATION"
A Brilliant Espousal and Defense of Ireland's Aims

Saturday eve, 8.30 p. m., May 22, 1920

at the **PEOPLE'S HOUSE AUDITORIUM**
7 East 15th Street, near Fifth Avenue

Reserved Seats $1.10 General Admission 55c

Tickets by mail from **THE SEVEN ARTS GUILD, 224 E. 12th Street, New York City**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

MEXICO.
The Fall Hearings Analyzed. By L. J. de Bekker..... 697
The Background of the Sonora Revolt..... 700
General Obregon's Proclamation..... 702
The Program of the Rebels..... 703

The Fall Hearings Analyzed

By L. J. DE BEKKER

A STATEMENT issued from the White House, and carried by the Associated Press on March 25, 1916, read as follows:

Convinced that powerful influences are at work to force an intervention in Mexico, Administration officials were today considering just what steps shall be taken to bring the agitation to an end. . . . President Wilson is said to be determined to stop the circulation of inflammatory rumors, and to take legal steps if necessary.

In his message to the last Mexican Congress, September 1, 1919, President Carranza said, according to an official translation:

The United States citizens interested in oil properties in Mexico, for their part initiated and maintain with a perfect organization, extraordinary strength, and remarkable persistence, a press campaign in the United States devised to impress the public mind of the country and the general mass as well as the members of both Houses by all possible means of the necessity to compel their Government to intervene in Mexico in order that our laws be drafted in perfect accordance with their personal interests, a finality which, of course, they do not frankly invoke, for they demand intervention on account of an alleged lack of guaranties prevailing in our country, an argument which easily impresses the public mind.

Either President Wilson and President Carranza were wrong in assuming that powerful interests in the United States were favoring an intervention in Mexico, or various spokesmen for those interests were wrong in denying it. It cannot, however, be disputed that the oil companies operating in Mexico are a powerful interest. Franklin K. Lane, recently Secretary of the Interior in Mr. Wilson's cabinet, is now a vice-president of the Mexican Petroleum Company at a salary of $50,000 a year, according to an announcement made by President Doheny. Mr. Lane declared in his testimony before Senator Fall on May 10, 1920, that "the attitude of the United States toward Mexico has been one of accumulating shame for seven years," thus aligning himself with his present, and against his former chief. To quote again the Associated Press:

"Don't you think the government ought to protect and encourage American citizens in their attempts to develop oil outside of the boundaries of the United States," asked Senator Brandegee, Republican, of Connecticut.

"I do," Mr. Lane said, "and have so recommended while in office."

Chairman Fall, citing English oil exploitation in Asia Minor, asked Mr. Lane if he thought that was a "menace."

"Not if Americans develop oil lying around the borders of the Caribbean Sea, as the English are developing around the south end of the Mediterranean Sea," was the response.

The oil interests, the metal and banking groups, and the great land owners like William Randolph Hearst, have been steadily opposing Article 27 of the new Constitution of 1917, and the agrarian laws made possible by this article. Now either there is a conspiracy on the part of American capitalists for an intervention in Mexico or there is not. If there is such a conspiracy, it would center against President Carranza, who insists upon enforcing Article 27, and favor some Mexican leader willing to rescind this article. With Article 27 eliminated, there would be no immediate necessity of an intervention, which could, at any rate, wait until after March 4, 1921. But if President Carranza were driven from power, and his successor in office not only failed to rescind Article 27, but to "pacify" the country, the argument for an immediate intervention would be stronger than ever. Such an argument might prove irresistible after March 4, 1921.

The existence of a conspiracy to force an intervention has been denied by practically everyone who might be concerned in it, including the agents and members of the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, and Senator Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico, "Mexican expert" of the Republican Senate majority.

It will be noted that the Sonora revolt developed after Senator Fall's return to Washington. The Philadelphia *Public Ledger* considers that the Sonora revolt grew out of opposition to the new Sonora agrarian law, which with Article 27 of the new Mexican Constitution, will fall if Governor de la Huerta and General Obregon oust President Carranza. Regarding this agrarian law, there is a widespread difference of opinion. The National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico found this law so diabolical that it issued a translation which was distributed to the press.

On Sunday, March 7, Senator Fall examined as a witness in Tucson, Arizona, Bracey Curtis, president of the First National Bank of Nogales, and of the Nogales Chamber of Commerce, in the same State. Nogales is a small town, the international boundary running through one of its streets, so that on the one side houses are in Mexico, and on the other in the United States. The business is chiefly in the southern or Mexican part of the dual city.

Mr. Curtis had opposed the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, and had, as President of the Chamber of Commerce, arranged for a conference on April 10 between Governor de la Huerta, of Sonora, and Governor Campbell, of Arizona, for an exchange of ideas and courtesies.

Senator FALL. Have you had your attention called to what is known as the agrarian law of the State of Sonora?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Senator FALL. Have you had any talk with Governor de la Huerta concerning the enforcement of that law?

Mr. Curtis replied that Governor de la Huerta had told him he thought the law would be rescinded, and that he was not in sympathy with it. Senator Fall then remarked that he had been in Nogales since Christmas—though Mr. Curtis, one of the leading citizens of the town was not aware of it—and made it clear that he had been in communication with de la Huerta.

Senator FALL. Of course, he [de la Huerta] did not tell you that he had replied in an entirely different way directly over his own signature to our Government?

Mr. CURTIS. No, sir.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator FALL. I do not intend to place this matter in the record except for your information, to say to you that the committee has in its possession a letter, an official letter from Mr. de la Huerta upon this subject which is entirely contrary to the statement which he made personally to you in reference to the enforcement of this law, and that the American Government has renewed its protest against the enforcement of the law. For your private information, not for the public. (Here the witness read said letter.) You cannot always tell from private conversation what may be going on officially?

Mr. CURTIS. No, sir.

Senator FALL. As a matter of fact the people—many of the people, I presume those at Nogales—have an idea that the protests of this Government to the Mexican Government in reference to their official action in matters of legislative decrees, etc., have been largely in reference to oil?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is the general opinion, yes. . . .

Senator FALL. Yet Mr. de la Huerta has declined to make a statement to the United States in reference to the agrarian law such as he made to you privately?

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, that is a Federal law. That was his opinion. Isn't that a Federal law?

Senator FALL. No; the Constitution of 1917 permits it.

Mr. CURTIS. Permits it; that is right.

Senator FALL. And the State has done it in this instance, and it is up to Mr. de la Huerta, as I stated there, to enforce it or not. The protest of this Government was first to the State Government, and then to the National Government, and answered by the National Government, and later answered by the State Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, that does not say what the State congress will do with that again.

Senator FALL. The State congress has enacted the law.

Mr. CURTIS. I mean the law.

Senator FALL. Oh, a new congress may repeal it; we hope the influence of you gentlemen along the border, who are on friendly terms with them, will have some effect.

Not only was Senator Fall able to foresee that a new State congress might repeal the Sonora agrarian law, but he had uncanny foreknowledge of trouble that was to come after his return to Washington and suggested a forecast of it to the witness:

Senator FALL. You have no reason, from your knowledge of Mexico, to anticipate there will be any armed disturbance in the State of Sonora?

Mr. CURTIS. Why, of course, at every election they have talk of a revolution.

Senator FALL. You have heard such talk?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Senator FALL. And the election will be held in June, this year?

Mr. CURTIS. I believe so; yes.

Senator FALL. General Obregon, who is a citizen of Sonora, is a candidate for the presidency?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Senator FALL. General Pablo Gonzales, who has been in command of the Army around in the city of Mexico, is also a candidate?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Senator FALL. And there are various other candidates of whom we have all heard?

Mr. CURTIS. They have spoken of Bonillas; I don't think he has formally announced yet.

Senator FALL. There is talk that there may be revolutionary troubles in Sonora and along the border?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

During the hearing Senator Fall suggested to the witness that Obregon had been much more careful than Villa in protecting American lives along the border.

Senator FALL. Did the Obregon troops fire at all across the line?

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, no.

Senator FALL. Didn't they come over the hill and fire into Nogales?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, of course, not deliberately fire into the United States. According to my understanding, I presume it was one of the Obregon men that shot Stephen D. Little, but that was purely accidental.

Senator FALL. Now, I want to say to you, Mr. Curtis, for your information and that of others, that this committee is not defending Mr. Obregon or Mr. Villa or attacking them. The committee plays no favorites at all in its investigation. We are trying to ascertain the facts—some are gratifying, and some are pessimistic.

Mr. CURTIS. We are optimistic ourselves, because we feel very happy and very encouraged over their condition.

Senator FALL. Despite official action and the laws they have?

Mr. CURTIS. They might do better on many laws, yet, on the other hand, many of our States in the United States make some very crazy laws. They haven't a monopoly on some of these foolish laws; they have been making them all over the United States.

At this session in Tucson, Senator Fall bitterly attacked an organization whose name he had forgotten, for sending out "Carrancista propaganda." He gave the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico a clean bill of health in these words:

Senator FALL. Then a director of the Association for the Protection of American Rights was called before this committee and was examined and cross-examined as to the foundation for these two stories, which, it was charged, were published for the purpose of inflaming opinion against Mexico. One was checked up with General Churchill behind it, in command of the Intelligence Department of the United States Army. The other was also checked up, showing that they were not guilty of seeking publicity or doing anything which they could not prove and which was not founded in fact.

How the National Association was "not guilty of seeking publicity" is better told by its employees than by Senator Fall. Bearing in mind President Carranza's charges, quoted at the beginning of this article, let the witnesses speak for themselves. Miss Agnes C. Laut, whose articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* and other publications pictured Mexican conditions as the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico desired, testified before Senator Fall on September 15. She got no pay for her stories from the Association, which, however, gently censored them.

The CHAIRMAN. Has this American Protective Association ever sought to control your evidence or writings?

MISS LAUT. Absolutely not. I will be very glad to tell you that the only change I made in my writing at their request was in the spelling of a Spanish name. I read Spanish and understand it when it is spoken slowly, but sometimes in writing Spanish names I might get the spelling wrong, or my stenographer might. I am very glad to say under oath the only change ever made at their suggestion was when I spelled the name "San Luis Potosi." I, knowing Quebec pretty well, spelled it in the French way and put an "o" in it. That is up to date the entire change that has been made in my writing at their suggestion. Once or twice I have asked them to give me the exact figures paid for taxation or something of that kind. I might have $12,500,000 as yearly export taxes and they would give me $12,566,000. It is simply a question of getting the accurate figures.

Before she went to Mexico, members of the Association

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sought out Miss Laut, and asked her to report to them on economic conditions.

Senator BRANDEGEE. That is the Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico?

MISS LAUT. Yes, sir. I was asked to make that report because after all the stability of a country depends on human conditions, and that is what I wanted to get. I agreed to do that. Shall I go right on with my visit to Mexico?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. But first, how were your expenses paid down there, if anyone paid them?

MISS LAUT. That brought up a very fine point. I agreed that I would make them a report if they would pay such expenses that would make it possible for me to take a constant companion, because I saw an international scrap coming, and I know the danger of blackmail in those international scraps, and I always take with me on those trips a married sister or an unmarried sister. I always go on such long trips, purely as a protection from misrepresentation, with a sister. They agreed, not the Protective Association, because it was not fully formed, but they agreed personally that the expenses of that trip would be sufficiently covered to take along a companion to cover blackmail protection.

Miss Laut was much interested in sex problems, because, as she testified, "in that case as a woman I saw red. I wanted to check up my facts, because sometimes stories were told me, and I could not sleep for three nights, thinking of the suffering of young American and Mexican girls. I found that the representative of one of the largest banks in the world had an investigation going on, and I hunted that man up. I said, 'Have you such and such facts that have been suppressed?' And that man had in his record 2,100 or 2,600 in a certain area where I heard a report of only 200." The witness continued:

I met good families, and I found that they had suffered just as much as the poor. I inquired about factories where 200 girls worked, not over 18 years of age, and certain factions had entered that factory and not one girl of the 200 escaped. I do not need to express more explicitly what I mean.

I think someone has spoken about nationalization of women there. I know of the boast of three generals in three different centers, one in Mexico City, one in Vera Cruz, and one in Tampico. Here are their words:

"The first time we took your motors; the second time we took your horses; the third time we took such and such an exaction of taxes; and the fourth time, if you do not submit to this exaction the next time we come, we will take your women."

I can tell of so many cases like that that the thing is harrowing. It is a thing for pathological study. . . .

Senator BRANDEGEE. What effect would it have in Mexico if this government did intervene with an army announcing that it came to establish order and stop the banditry and to help them to help themselves to set up some form of government of their own; that they were not going to stay there or annex their territory, or anything of that kind? Have you any means of forming an opinion as to how that proposition would be received by the people of Mexico?

MISS LAUT. Well, I have been told by their own leaders that if such a beneficent pacification were undertaken and followed by thousands of cars of food that a hurdle sixteen feet high would not stop the population coming en masse behind and supporting the movement.

Charles H. Boynton, the director of the Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico referred to by Senator Fall, as witness that there was no effort to seek publicity that would inflame opinion against Mexico, testified before the committee on September 16, 1919:

Senator BRANDEGEE. We have asked the other representatives of these other associations that have appeared before us what their salaries were; that is, the publicity men, so to speak. What is your salary?

Mr. BOYNTON. $20,000 a year.

By way of proving that Mr. Boynton was not seeking publicity of a character tending to inflame Americans against Mexico, Senator Fall ordered "Boynton Appendix A" to be printed in the record, thus giving wider publicity to approximately 34,000 words he had issued in printed form up to that date. The *Monthly Bulletin*, *Weekly Clipsheet*, and daily releases to the press, and the writings of such interventionist authors as Miss Laut and Mr. William Gates, were not republished. Mr. Boynton began work on March 25, 1919, with Charles F. Carter as his publicity assistant, and Frank J. Silsbee, secretary. He said there were 130 or 140 active members, and 1,916 associate members, with branch offices in Washington, El Paso, and Los Angeles, and headquarters in New York.

On November 15, 1919, Joseph T. Annin, who described himself as Washington representative of the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, appeared to tell how he prepared the sensational "Disorder Map of Mexico," printed in the New York *Times*, and other interventionist newspapers some days earlier.

On December 29, 1919, Edward R. Sartwell, who called himself a publicity agent employed by the same organization, told how he prepared the "Murder Map of Mexico," published by the New York *Times* and other newspapers.

On September 11, Edward L. Doheny, President of the Mexican Petroleum Company, the Huasteca Petroleum Company, etc., and a leading spirit in the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, testified that he was still supporting the bandit Pelaez in rebellion against the Mexican Government.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Are you now having to pay tribute to anybody for protection at the present time?

Mr. DOHENY. We are paying tribute to Pelaez.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Now, Mr. Doheny?

Mr. DOHENY. Now.

Senator BRANDEGEE. Every month?

Mr. DOHENY. Every month.

Senator BRANDEGEE. At what rate, now?

Mr. DOHENY. I do not know the rate.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the total payment to all of the companies?

Mr. DOHENY. The total payment to all of the companies is less than $30,000.

Congressman La Guardia said the grand total was $190,000 a month, while George Agnew Chamberlain, former Consul General at Mexico City and author of many anti-Mexican articles, made the following interesting comments —according to the Associated Press—on the present system whereby American money supports Mexican bandits.

"Events are moving fast there now, but the essential difficulties will remain under any Mexican administration likely to come into power."

Mr. Chamberlain said that President Wilson's "assertion that big interests favored intervention was particularly shameful."

"It was the American small farmer and business man who suffered always," he added. "The big corporation paid the graft. They could pay the graft, the others had to flee."

In the light of such statements it would hardly appear that the organized American interests in Mexico were aiding the cause of law and order or were "not guilty of seeking publicity," as Senator Fall in the course of his "impartial investigation" has sought to prove.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Background of the Sonora Revolt

THE following correspondence between the authorities of the State of Sonora and the Mexican Federal Government was published soon after the disturbances in Sonora began.

HERMOSILLO, SONORA, April 4, 1920

SENOR V. CARRANZA,
MEXICO, D. F.

Last night I received an answer to my conference of the 31st ultimo. Most respectfully I beg to state that in my former message I pointed out that I had always opposed crediting the current news of the press which I referred to before, because of the absolute lack of truth contained in such news in regard to this matter. If I have addressed myself to you in this respect, it is not because the Government under my charge is willing to commit itself as the author of the reigning alarm; I have addressed myself to you because I believe that it is my duty respectfully to let you know the situation and conditions which actually exist at present as well as to seek the tranquillity of the people of Sonora and the normal continuation of all affairs in this State, thus avoiding those disturbances that might occur due to circumstances, real or supposed. Now, for the first time on this occasion I am going to give you some other details, in order that with your experience and knowledge of public affairs you may be able to appreciate in a better light the true situation. . . . It is necessary to oppose press dispatches and private reports reaching this capitol with facts that will remove the belief that there is the intention of exercising an absolute military control over this State, and that such determination has as an aim electoral purposes contrary to our democratic principles which have been obtained through great hardships suffered by the people. . . .

The developments which have made a very vivid impression on the minds of the people are the following: The Federal Government has issued orders to the Customs Houses to transfer their funds to American territory. This order was carried out in such an ostentatious and incautious manner that it has given vent to numberless comments, which are worthy of attention not only within our country, but in the United States as well. A few days ago rumors were current among the troops, as well as among the people in general, that the funds which had been just received to pay said troops were to be returned immediately to Nogales, thus stopping payment of the soldiers. This fact left a bad impression on the minds of all the people who are not aware of the true reason for such action. It is widely known here that when the Collector of Internal Revenue asked for one hundred and seventy-five thousand pesos' worth of stamps, the Department of the Treasury sent him only seventeen thousand dollars worth of stamps.

Notwithstanding the reiterated requests of the Government under my charge, at the time when there really existed a state of rebellion among the Yaqui Indians in this State, it was never possible to get the marine forces to come to Guaymas. It is a source of surprise among all the people who are aware of this fact to see that now, when the State is in a peaceful condition, there appear in Guaymas said marine forces, with instructions to double their number. On the other hand, this Government never fully informed the inhabitants of the State of Sonora that the Federal Government would provide the funds for the payment of the Rural Forces during their campaign with the Yaqui Indians. Then your decision, which is in contradiction to your previous offer, and which compelled us to discharge the men recruited by the Government of this State, was widely spread throughout the State by the discharged men who were returning to their respective homes after having lent their contingent, and was a source of distrust in regard to future plans.

The change of attitude of the Treasury Department in permitting the exportation of all kinds of cattle, notwithstanding the firm assurances made by said Department that said measure was anti-economic and inconvenient, has as a result spread the belief that such measure is only aimed to provoke the elimination of that element so necessary for the subsistence of the inhabitants of these regions, thus handicapping the people in providing for their necessities at a future moment of unrest, which the Federal Government itself might create.

I must add that there exists now a rumor, which is accepted as truthful, that the Federal Government has come into parleys with Maytorena and his followers, and this attitude has been interpreted as an effort to produce a schism in public opinion in order to create difficulties for the Government of this State. Such news has been confirmed by the contents of the correspondence exchanged by the followers of Maytorena themselves. I have had in my possession said news and I have been able to observe also that *El Democrate*, a newspaper that is considered as an official organ, in all its recent editorials openly and frankly sustains the thesis of the justification for the sending of forces to this region of the Republic so as to depose from his post the Governor of the State of Sonora, because he is supposed to be an Obregon follower, and substitute for him another person whose policy may satisfy the tendencies of the Government of the Republic.

These facts added to the other comments inspired by the withdrawal of the artillery forces, the imperative order for sending the surplus armaments as well as all the rapid-firing guns, in accordance with the contents of the order given to the military authorities, to enable them to watch and control all the developments of the political campaign—orders that are well known by the people of all the small sections where matters of this kind cannot be kept secret—make it difficult for the Government of the State to let its official voice be heard in order to destroy the suppositions. To do that it would be necessary to be able to explain all the reasons that have guided the Government in each step taken; and I must confess that the same Government of the State is itself ignorant of the antecedents which prompted the issuing of such orders. If my explanations were not backed by powerful and convincing reasons, as well as by clear facts, they would not be efficacious because people judge me as an optimist and with too much confidence in the Central Government. . . .

That peace may prevail in this State, it is necessary to avoid any decision which might augment the existing unrest. With reference to my fears that the Yaqui Indians may rebel again on account of the presence here of General Dieguez as Chief of Operations in this region, I must tell you that this is not a personal opinion, but it is the opinion of the Indians themselves, who have informed me that the presence of General Dieguez would not give them any guaranties, because they are under the impression that in the year 1915, when they discussed the treaties of peace with said General, they detected a certain hostility, which prompted them to discontinue the negotiations with him. Right or wrong, there is a reason for the Yaqui Indians to harbor such resentment. General Dieguez is perfectly aware of the situation in regard to that tribe. In view of the foregoing, I again beg you to consult with him upon this matter so as to obtain a complete view of the situation. . . . If the distrust shown by the Yaqui Indians toward General Dieguez should compel them to return to the mountains—lacking as they do all the necessities of life—they would be compelled to steal. Under such conditions the forces would have to pursue them, and the struggle which for so many years has devastated this region would be renewed again, and the hopes entertained by the inhabitants of Sonora would come to naught. I believe it to be a great responsibility for us, who have in our hands the solution of the Yaqui problem, to commit errors of opinion. . . .

I shall hasten my trip in order to confer with you, but before doing so, I must respectfully ask you to tell me in the name of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people and the peace of the State to cancel the orders for the sending of troops to Sonora, where their presence is not required at present; in as much as there is not any fighting going on in this State it would be extremely difficult to preserve the peace, since the forces garrisoning the cities and other sections of the country are only sufficient for the time being. I have no doubt that you will have confidence in my assurances in regard to preserving the peace throughout the State, and I hope that you will kindly let me know whether you will cancel, as I hope, the mobilization order, so that I may be able to communicate it to the people of this State.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you the assurances of my highest consideration.

A. DE LA HUERTA

APRIL 9, 1920

SENOR ADOLFO DE LA HUERTA,
GOVERNOR OF THE STATE.
HERMOSILLO, SONORA.

I refer to your telegram of the 4th instant. I say again for your information, what I said in my telegram of even date addressed to the State Legislature in regard to the constitutional viewpoint on this matter: I cannot, as a matter of fact, discuss with the Government of one State the convenience or inconvenience of military measures adopted under my constitutional powers; but I wish to call your attention to the position of a State that in any form, or under any pretext, should try to resist—as a violation of its sovereignty—the military measures adopted by the Federal Government. This would be equal to an immediate declaration of insurrection or to the breaking up of the Federal Covenant on the part of that State. Not only may I not cancel the orders for the mobilization of Federal troops, but in view of the categorical declarations of the Legislature of that State, this matter has become already a question of principle which is indispensable for the Federal Government to sustain vigorously in order to preserve its authority and the unity of the Republic. If there had not existed many other reasons for the adoption of military measures of a prudent and cautious nature, enough cause would have been given by the statement of the Legislature of the State, which was communicated to the Federal Executive, to the effect that it would consider any mobilization of troops an affront to its sovereignty.

The matter of responsibility for the consequences that the movement of troops might bring is not necessary to discuss, because I fully accept beforehand all responsibility for the acts ordered by me. The responsibility for the acts that the authorities of Sonora may commit by disobeying the law as a protest or resistance against an altogether legitimate action of the Federal Government is a different matter. I do not intend to convince you and the other officials of the State that the aims of those military measures attributed to me without any foundation whatever are untrue; namely, to displace by stratagem the local authorities and to interfere in electoral matters. The trampling over the power of the local authorities, apart from being a mere supposition which is not justified by my former conduct and respect for the law and the constitutional authorities, could not be carried out without relying upon the previous complacence, or the lack of civil courage of the authorities; and as regards the previous conduct of the Sonora authorities, as well as the personal knowledge that I have of you, I believe that the supposition is offensive both to the Federal and local governments.

As regards the supposed electoral pressure which it is thought might be exercised by the Federal Government having a large number of troops in Sonora, it is not even logical—as you frankly stated—to believe that the inhabitants of the State of Sonora in the coming elections will vote unanimously in favor of General Alvaro Obregon, even if all the authorities are in sympathy with said candidacy. The presence of Federal troops, no matter how large they might be, could not change the situation in the least, as they would be entirely controlled by the State and municipal authorities. . . .

I sincerely wish to convey my opinion that the attitude of the Sonora authorities in opposing the sending of Federal forces is excessively suspicious. Using this method of reasoning, it could be said that since this is a military movement which the Executive has a perfect right to order and execute within normal conditions, instead of being a source of alarm it should be a source of public rejoicing. But the act of trying to find crooked aims in that decision of the Executive clearly shows that the presence of Federal troops might be taken by the Government of that State to mean opposition to unknown purposes. . . . Speaking plainly about the state of things in Sonora, I will tell you that had the Executive not had powerful reasons to believe that the presence of Federal troops was necessary there to forestall any future revolt brought about on electoral excuses, the attitude of that Government gives us cause to believe that the authorities of Sonora would not wish the presence of Federal troops in that territory because after insurrection there had been decided upon the presence of those forces would only disarrange and upset all your plans or at least precipitate events. I certainly would be sorry if you should consider this expression of opinion on the matter as an insulting one to the loyalty of the authorities of that State; but if you compare this opinion with the intention attributed to me by General Calles, by the Legislature of the State, and by you yourself, of trying to upset the Government of Sonora and suppress the public vote in your own territory, the latter would be more injurious—with the difference that it is absolutely futile on your part to try to turn to legal reasoning to defend your assertion. In order to keep you and me within the limits of our public functions, I allow myself to remind you that Article 103 of the Federal Constitution empowers the Supreme Court to take a hand in all those conflicts in which the sovereignty of the States may appear violated, so that any other act of the authorities of the State of Sonora that may not come under the legal remedy provided by said Article 103, will have to be considered by me as an act of insurrection.

To close, I must tell you that in regard to responsibility . . . I am fully willing to accept the responsibility that may be involved in the transgression of the law or the disobedience or insurrection provoked by the authorities of the State of Sonora—burdens which I believe should be accepted with courage without trying to blame them on the Federal Government.

V. CARRANZA

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC,
MEXICO.

By circular telegraphic message that General Dieguez sends from Guadalajara, dated the 3rd instant, to all the Mayors of the State, it has been officially confirmed that the Executive Power under your charge has ordered the mobilization of some forces towards this State, giving to said General the post of Chief of the Military Operations. You assure that said mobilization obeys only the necessities of the campaign which are due to special circumstances that in the judgment of the Government are deemed necessary. It is perfectly well known that here in Sonora there does not exist any military campaign whatever, because now more than at any other time the State is enjoying complete calm and peace. In regard to the special circumstances to which you point in your telegraphic message of the 4th instant, addressed to the Governor of the State, it is perfectly and clearly shown that said circumstances cannot be other than the deliberate and imperious intention that exists in official circles of the Administration to carry into effect a terrible joke played on the popular vote during the coming elections. So that in view of this fact, the State Congress in session today has unanimously deemed it necessary to state to you, in a very earnest and strong manner, that the people of Sonora consider such a mobilization an immediate and direct attack on their sov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ereignty; and they believe that if the Executive Power under your charge insists upon said mobilization, the same Executive will be the only one responsible for all the consequences, because then the people of Sonora will try to fulfil their duty with dignity. Please accept our most distinguished consideration.

PRESIDENT GILBERTO VALENZUELA
VICE PRESIDENT LUIS V. CHAVEZ
SECRETARY E. BUSTAMANTE
SECRETARY AMELIANO CORRELLA
N. LEONCIO
I. ORTIZ
IGNACIO G. SOTO
FELIZARDO FRIAS
ALEJO GAY
C. LOPEZ

ALFONSO ALMARA

HERMOSILLO, SONORA, April 6, 1920

MEXICO CITY, April 9, 1920.

To the Representatives to the Legislature of the State of Sonora, Hermosillo:

I have received the telegram of that Legislature, dated the 7th instant, in which, after pointing out what in your own judgment are the conditions of the State of Sonora and the military necessities of the State, and what you think are the intentions of the Executive Power, you close by stating in a very unmistakable manner that the people of Sonora find that there is an attack on their sovereignty in the action of the mobilization of those forces; and that if the Executive insists upon said mobilization, I will be the only person responsible for the natural consequences that said movement of forces may bring in the future.

I have no objection to accepting the responsibility for the acts carried into effect by the orders that I have issued. Now, with reference to the consequences that might result from the fulfilment of my orders, I cannot find out what are your fears in regard to the measures that might be adopted by the authorities of the State of Sonora which could not be embraced within the power of our Constitution, where it is provided that any official of the Federal Authority, who may dare to transgress the law or attack the sovereignty of the States will be subject to the application of a constitutional remedy by means of the Supreme Court of Justice; and I do not believe nor expect that the authorities of the State of Sonora would like to resort to violent measures, because in that case the responsibility for those illegal measures could not fall upon me. But if the object of your telegram is to avoid or shirk responsibilities for the future developments in the State of Sonora, while at the same time you pretend to put the blame on the Federal Executive Power, I only want to say that I take due note of the intentions conveyed in the telegram above mentioned without failing to point out that the Government is firmly disposed to meet strictly and energetically any attempt to create disorder. . . . With reference to the principal point of this matter, namely, that the Legislature of the State of Sonora should be the only one to judge the propriety of the military measures taken, I beg to say that I do not consider it necessary even to discuss the point, because by the Constitution only the Executive is responsible for the preservation of peace throughout the Republic, and the same Executive is the only one who is capable of judging whether or not it is necessary to resort to such measures. If every one of the States of the Republic were going to discuss the orders issued by the Executive Power not only under normal conditions but at a time, like the present, when the pacification of the entire country has not been completed and there exists yet the fear of new disturbances, then the said Executive would have to submit to the decision of every one of the different governmental entities and its decisions regarding internal as well as external defense would be nullified if every one of the States of the Union was to have the right to claim that the sending of forces to its territory was a violation of its sovereignty. The principle of union in our Republic would be completely destroyed; and the ties of the Federation entirely broken. There is only one step between the attitude assumed by the Sonora Legislature and the idea of absolute independence. . . .

V. CARRANZA

General Obregon's Proclamation

AFTER General Obregon left Mexico City in the middle of April, he issued a proclamation explaining his reasons for abandoning his political campaign and adopting military measures. The text of the proclamation is taken from the *Prensa* (San Antonio) of May 6.

When I permitted the use of my name as a candidate for president of the Republic, in a proclamation issued at Nogales, Sonora, on the 1st of June, 1918, I was prompted by the assurance that the political campaign would be conducted with complete accordance to the law, and that the present president of the Republic would see to it that during the campaign the authorities of the country maintained the strictest neutrality so that the people of the Republic would be able to elect their president with entire freedom and to the best of their ability. I believed this because the present president of the Republic was the leader of the bloody revolution of 1913, which was a continuation of the one initiated in 1910 by Francisco I. Madero, the apostle of democracy, a revolution that had for its aim the freedom of election.

Facts, however, have forced us to face the painful reality. . . . The present president of the Republic, forgetting his capacity as the highest authority in the country, became the head of a political faction, and placed all the resources which the country entrusted him with, at the service of that faction. Then, in open violation of ethical principles, he used the national treasury to pay for press propaganda, he has attempted to use the national army as a weapon of coercion, and he has persecuted, calumniated, and intrigued against those among the officers of the army who refused to act in a way they considered dishonorable and unsoldierly. . . .

The president of the Republic, who is in fact the head of the party supporting Bonillas for president, realized that an immense majority of the citizens of the Republic repudiated with dignity such imposition, and he provoked an armed conflict so that he could obtain by violence a success he could not get within the law. To this conflict, which was provoked in the State of Sonora, the authorities and the citizens of that State have answered with a dignity that has deserved the praise of every good son of our Fatherland.

The president of the Republic, seeing himself humiliated by the attitude of Sonora, thought that he could prevent things from going further and that he could make that State change its mind, by making false charges against the independent candidate, involving him in a criminal case, and having him watched closely by the same men who recently committed a criminal assault at Tampico. Under the circumstances, it is impossible to continue the political campaign and it is absolutely necessary to take up arms again, in order to defend that which he attempts to deprive us of by force of arms.

With the suspension of the political campaign for the above stated reasons, I have decided, as usual, to turn temporarily into a soldier, as I have done every time the institutions of my country have been in danger, and at the head of the great Liberal Party which under different names supported my nomination in the political campaign, I place myself under the orders of the constitutional governor of the free and sovereign State of Sonora, in order to support him in his determination, and cooperate with him, until the Federal powers are overturned. . . .

I do not intend to attain power by the road of violence, and I declare solemnly that I will act absolutely under the orders of the constitutional governor of Sonora, who has stood with dignity and patriotism for our rights which were conquered by the people in a bloody struggle of ten years and which have been at the point of being destroyed by the criminal action of a man who betrayed them.

A. OBREGON

CHILPANCINGO DE BRAVOS, GUERRERO, APRIL 20, 1920.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Program of the Rebels

THE program of the Sonora rebellion, signed at Agua Prieta on April 23 by more than one hundred officers of the army and civil officials, is here reproduced from the *Heraldo de Mexico* (Los Angeles) of April 24.

ORGANIC PLAN OF THE MOVEMENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY AND LAW

ARTICLE 1. Venustiano Carranza ceases hereby in his capacity as chief executive of the Republic.

ARTICLE 2. All public officials whose authority has its origin in the last election in the States of Guanajuato, San Luis Potosi, Queretaro, Nuevo Leon, and Tamaulipas, are hereby repudiated.

ARTICLE 3. The members of the municipal council of the City of Mexico who were declared elected in consequence of the recent election are also hereby repudiated.

ARTICLE 4. José Santos Godínez is hereby recognized as Constitutional Governor of the State of Nayarit.

ARTICLE 5. Recognition is also granted hereby to all legitimate Federal and State authorities. The Liberal Constitutional Army will support said authorities, as long as they do not oppose or antagonize the present movement.

ARTICLE 6. The political Constitution of February 5, 1917, is hereby expressly recognized.

ARTICLE 7. The Liberal Constitutional Army shall be formed by all generals and officers who may support this program. The present Constitutional governor of Sonora, C. Adolfo de la Huerta, shall act temporarily as supreme head of the army, with all necessary power for the political, military, and administrative organization of this movement.

ARTICLE 8. The Constitutional governors of the States supporting and assisting this movement shall each appoint within thirty days after the date of the present program a representative, duly authorized, and said delegates, at a meeting to be held sixty days after the date of the present program, at such place as designated by the supreme chief *ad interim*, shall appoint, by a majority of votes, the permanent supreme chief of the Constitutional Army.

ARTICLE 9. If for any circumstances, originated by the campaign, the meeting provided for in Article 8 is not attended by the required majority, the present Constitutional governor, C. Adolfo de la Huerto, shall act thereafter as the permanent head of the Liberal Constitutional Army.

ARTICLE 10. As soon as the present program is adopted by the majority of the country, and the City of Mexico is occupied by the Liberal Constitutional Army, a provisional president of the Republic shall be designated in the manner provided below.

ARTICLE 11. Should the present movement be accomplished before the end of the present congressional term, the Supreme Chief of the Liberal Constitutional Army shall call an extraordinary session of Congress, at the best available place, and the members of Congress shall elect the provisional president in conformity with the Constitution.

ARTICLE 12. Should the case referred to in Article 11 occur after the end of the present congressional term, the supreme chief of the Liberal Constitutional Army shall assume the office of provisional president of the Republic.

ARTICLE 13. The provisional president shall call the election of executive and legislative powers of the Republic immediately after he assumes office.

ARTICLE 14. The supreme chief of the Liberal Constitutional Army shall appoint provisional governors for the States of Guanajuato, San Luis Potosi, Queretaro, Nuevo Leon, and Tamaulipas, and of any other State whose governor may oppose or repudiate this movement.

ARTICLE 15. After the triumph of this program is consolidated, the provisional president shall give the provisional governors the authority to call immediately a local election in accordance with the respective statutes.

ARTICLE 16. The Liberal Constitutional Army shall be governed by the military laws and regulations now in force in the Republic.

ARTICLE 17. The supreme chief of the Liberal Constitutional Army and all military and civil authorities supporting this program shall grant both Mexicans and foreigners full guaranties, and shall protect especially commerce and business in general.

FREE VOTE. NO REELECTION.

AGUA PRIETA, SONORA, APRIL 23, 1920.

Training for Authorship

How to write, what to write, and where to sell.

Cultivate your mind. Develop your literary gifts. Master the art of self-expression. Make your spare time profitable. Turn your ideas into dollars.

Courses in Short-Story Writing, Versification, Journalism, Play Writing, Photoplay Writing, etc., taught personally by Dr. J. Berg Esenwein, for many years editor of Lippincott's Magazine, and a staff of literary experts. Constructive criticism. Frank, honest, helpful advice. *Real teaching.*

Dr. Esenwein

One pupil has received over $5,000 for stories and articles written mostly in spare time—"play work," he calls it. Another pupil received over $1,000 before completing her first course. Another, a busy wife and mother, is averaging over $75 a week from photoplay writing alone.

There is no other institution or agency doing so much for writers, young or old. The universities recognize this, for over one hundred members of the English faculties of higher institutions are studying in our Literary Department. The editors recognize it, for they are constantly recommending our courses.

We publish *The Writer's Library*, 13 volumes; descriptive booklet free. We also publish *The Writer's Monthly*, the leading magazine for literary workers; sample copy 20 cents, annual subscription $2.00. Besides our teaching service, we offer a manuscript criticism service.

150-Page illustrated catalogue free. *Please Address*

The Home Correspondence School
Dept. 79 Springfield, Mass.
ESTABLISHED 1897 INCORPORATED 1904

LABOR LAWS of SOVIET RUSSIA

These laws have been reprinted, with an explanatory introduction, from "Soviet Russia," and are sold to the public at 10c per copy. Other laws and official documents will be reprinted later in similar pamphlet form. Special rates in quantities.

"SOVIET RUSSIA"
110 West 40th St. *Room 304* New York, N. Y.

Are you reading the weekly "Soviet Russia"?

Strunsky Restaurants

Eat where the food is good, the environment pleasant and the prices right :: :: ::

THREE STEPS DOWN
19 West 8th Street
UPTOWN BRANCH
34 West 35th Street

201 Second Avenue

Watch Your Weight

It is often an index to your health.
Do you know how to *decrease* your weight—or *increase* it?
Dr. Brady's book—

"Personal Health"

tells you how—and many other things that make for mental and physical fitness. Nothing technical about it—just common-sense plain English. $1.50

At Bookstores or

W. B. SAUNDERS COMPANY, Philadelphia

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literary Agencies and Exchanges

Authors, Playwrights, Dramatists, Teachers

ALICE KAUSER
DRAMATISTS' AGENT—PLAYS
1402 Broadway, New York Established 1895
MOTION PICTURE DEPARTMENT
R. L. GIFFEN, Associate and Manager

THE FISK TEACHERS' AGENCIES
EVERETT O. FISK & Co., *Proprietors.*
Boston, 2A Park Street. Chicago, 814 Steger Bldg. New York, 225 Fifth Ave. Denver, 317 Masonic Bldg. Syracuse, 402 Dillaye Bld. Portland, 909 Journal Bldg. Pittsburg, 549 Un. Arcade. Berkeley, 2161 Shattuck Av. Birmingham, 809 Title Bld. Los Angeles, 510 Spring St. Send to any address above for registration form.

HARLAN P. FRENCH, Pres. W. W. ANDREWS, Sec.
ALBANY TEACHERS' AGENCY, Inc.
Supplies Schools and Colleges with Competent Teachers. Assists Teachers in obtaining positions. Send for Bulletin. 81 Chapel Street, Albany, N. Y.

WANTED
More public speakers to lecture. We furnish the lectures and help you get started. Public Speakers Supply, Ridgway, Pa.

Western University
Applications are invited for an instructorship in French and Spanish. Stipend, $2,000.00 or $2,200.00 with the summer school. Young Canadian or man of Latin origins preferred, but applicants must speak both languages and have had college experience in teaching. Letters, with references and recommendations, may be sent to the Dean, *Dr. W. Sherwood Fox, Western University, London, Canada.*

YOUNG COLLEGE WOMAN wants position with girls who would appreciate outdoor dancing. Coaching in Elementary and High School subjects, French, German. Salary $100. E. SELDEN, 57 East 56th St., N. Y. C.

RABBI EMANUEL STERNHEIM will make a limited number of lecture engagements. For rates, subjects, and open dates, address *Rabbi Sternheim, Sioux City, Iowa.*

The Goldthwaite Inn
Bellport, Long Island, on Great South Bay
Cool Comfortable Charming
SAILING BATHING TENNIS GOLF
Table Supplied from Own Farm Circular

Whitehall 1877, 1878, 1879
UNITED STATES FORWARDING CO.
55 Broadway, New York
International forwarders and freight contractors, Agents for SCHENKER & COMPANY (75 branches and more than 600 agencies throughout Europe). Through rates from and to European points—sea freight—insurance—storage—facilities for relief shipments to Europe.

ACROSS THE BLOCKADE
Record of Travels In Enemy Europe
By HENRY NOEL BRAILSFORD
The clearest and most illuminating work yet published in America about what has happened in Central Europe since the Armistice. Parts of some of the chapters originally appeared in *The Nation, New Republic,* and *Manchester Guardian.* 8vo. Cloth. pp. 174. Published by Harcourt, Brace & Howe. Published Price $1.50. Our Special Price 85 cents.
A Splendid New Bargain Catalog In Preparation. Send For It.
McDEVITT-WILSON'S, Inc.
30 Church St. (Hudson Terminal) 55 Vesey St. New York City

Advocate of Peace
Monthly Official Organ
American Peace Society
Founded 1828

Edited where national and international currents converge.

Favors a "law-governed world, a peace through justice."

Furnishes news, texts of state papers, articles by specialists, and reasoned editorial opinions about the world that is and is to be.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *Editor* GEORGE PERRY MORRIS, *Assistant Editor*

Mail your subscription today
$1.50

American Peace Society
612, 613, 614 Colorado Bldg.
Washington, D. C.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY *of* CALIFORNIA
Monographs and separates in Sciences, Economics, History, Philology, Philosophy, etc.
List of titles and prices free on request.
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

MARRIAGE As IT Was, Is, and SHOULD BE. By Annie Besant. That intensely interesting Brochure, 25c. The Scarlet Review, No. 1, 25c. each. Diana, A Psycho-Physiological Essay on Sexual Relations, 25c. The Crucible (Agnostic), 4 samples, 10c.
RAYMER'S OLD BOOK STORE
1330 First Avenue Seattle, Wash.

Spanish Books
WHOLESALE ALL SUBJECTS RETAIL
Spanish Dailies and Periodicals
COMPAÑIA HISPANO-AMERICANA
156 West 14th St., cor. 7th Ave., N. Y.

JOSEPH STURGE
By STEPHEN HOBHOUSE
"A life-like picture of one streng and admirable personality"—the Birmingham Friend who was so honorably associated with the early 19th century reforms, political, social, and educational.
Price $1.50 **E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY** 681 5th Ave., New York

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law
Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University
The Paris Bourse and French Finance
With Reference to Organized Speculation in New York
No. 204
By WILLIAM PARKER, Ph.D.
Paper Covers. $1.00

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVE. AND 30TH ST., NEW YORK

Foreign and American Dealers in
Books, Autographs, Manuscripts, Engravings

To All Book-Collectors
Messrs. HENRY SOTHERAN & CO. will be pleased to hear from Collectors, who are in want of any individual Book, of which they will endeavor to find and report particulars, without any obligation to the inquirer. They also keep a register of special Subjects, and if Collectors will let them know the class of Book they are interested in, they will report suitable items as they come into stock from time to time.
HENRY SOTHERAN & CO.,
43, Piccadilly, W. 1.
or, 140, Strand, W. C. 2.
London, England.
Cables: Bookmen, London.

BOOKS—All out-of-print books supplied, no matter on what subject. Write us. We can get you any book ever published. Please state wants. When in England call and see our 50,000 rare books. BAKER'S GREAT BOOKSHOP, 14-16 John Bright Street, Birmingham, England.

Autographs BOOKS Manuscripts
Catalogues post free from HERBERT E. GORFIN, 1, Walerand Road, Lewisham London, S. E. 13

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES TO BE HAD at ABRAHAM'S BOOK STORE, 145 4th Avenue

BOOKS, AUTOGRAPHS, PRINTS Catalogues Free
R. ATKINSON, 188, Peckham Rye, London, S.E. 22, England

FOR THE BOOK LOVER
Rare books—First editions.
Latest Catalogues Sent on Request
C. GERHARDT, 25 W. 42d Street, New York

SCANDINAVIAN CLASSICS
Authoritative translations of the best of the Literature of the North.
Published by
THE AMERICAN-SCANDINAVIAN FOUNDATION
25 West 45th Street, New York

The CENTRALIA CONSPIRACY
By Ralph Chaplin Price 50 Cents

What Happened in Centralia?

The newspapers said that unoffending paraders were killed without provocation or excuse by ambushed I. W. W.'s.

DO YOU BELIEVE IT?

Papers telling the truth about the tragedy were shut down or denied the use of the mails.
This remarkable booklet contains an accurate and complete story of the whole affair. It reveals startling facts—suppressed facts—facts that you were never intended to hear.
Read about the tremendous and bitter struggle of the Western lumberjacks against the Lumber Trust for better conditions.
Get a copy of this booklet at any progressive bookstore (Price 50 cents), or order by mail from any of the following places: Geo. Williams, Box 1873, Seattle, Wash.; Frank Gould, 318 No. Wyoming St., Butte, Montana; Thos. Whitehead, 1001 West Madison St., Chicago, Ill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED